

at the year 1958 when residual stocks continued to mount as imports increased. Residual went from \$2.95 per barrel in January to \$2.37 by late summer—a drop of 58 cents, equivalent to \$2.44 per ton in terms of coal. Actually, a great deal of residual was sold under the list—as low or even lower than \$2 per barrel (\$8.40 coal equivalent).

I am informed that users of coal are often lured into converting to residual oil by cut-

throat prices which will offset the cost of conversion, and I am also advised that the oil companies will not enter into contracts to deliver oil at a definite and stable price but, instead, promise to meet and undersell the price of coal. This type of competition is unconscionable and it simply cannot be met.

Mr. Secretary, I do not ask for complete elimination of residual fuel oil imports. I do ask for a substantial reduction. I main-

tain that the quotas on residual oil imports should be so designed to permit the coal industry, the domestic oil industry, and the transportation industry to meet the needs of exploration and research, repair and replace damaged and obsolete equipment, recoup employment losses, and maintain a capability to meet the expanded needs of a national emergency. I ask nothing more. One could expect nothing less.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 133: 1: Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

O Thou, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that in this Brotherhood Week men and nations may be lifted, by the mighty tide of Thy grace and love, into a more fraternal relationship.

We pray that we may never harbor within our minds and hearts those thoughts and feelings which were alien to the Master's spirit of compassion and consideration, of patience and kindness.

Inspire us with a clearer vision of the many noble and helpful things which we are daily privileged to do together for the health and happiness of mankind everywhere.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to a joyous and victorious fulfillment those capacities and lofty aspirations with which Thou didst endow the soul of man, created in Thine own image and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 610. An act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board;

S. 707. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 804. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules.

The message also announced that the Secretary had been directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 681) entitled

"An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 38, 75th Congress, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and the Senator from Kansas, Mr. SCHOEPPPEL, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the Senator from California, Mr. ENGLE, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD; the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. METCALF; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE; the Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT; the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BOGGS; and the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH, to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group meeting to be held in Ottawa February 22 to 25, inclusive.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpoena duces tecum which directs me to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey to testify in the case of the United States of America against Harvey O'Connor.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES v. HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232-59

To FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 31st day of May 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of

United States v. Harvey O'Connor and bring with you the documents and objects listed in the schedule attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.,
Clerk.

By MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavits, attorneys for defendant.
MAY 19, 1960.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232-59.

SCHEDULE—TO SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

(a) The original minute book of the House Un-American Activities Committee and of the subcommittee of the Un-American Activities Committee, which held hearings in Newark in 1958, and if there be no original minute book, the minutes of all meetings of the Un-American Activities Committee or the said subcommittee authorizing the 1958 Newark hearings, authorizing the issuance of subpoenas in connection therewith, and recommending proceedings by contempt against Harvey O'Connor.

(b) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to Harvey O'Connor, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee in the questioning of Harvey O'Connor.

(c) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness in Newark, N.J., in 1958 in relation to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

(d) All records and logbooks kept by the House Un-American Activities Committee in respect to the issuance of subpoenas in June, July, August, and September 1958 and the carbon copies of all subpoenas issued in that period in respect to hearings relating to the Newark area.

(e) All memoranda of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee, minutes of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, reports by the committee staff or reports of any other Government agency in the files of the committee, summaries of interviews, affidavits, statements, recordings, correspondence, press releases, proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness, or any other material prepared for or used (relating to

the subject of any of the hearings in respect to Newark in 1958).

(f) Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held in 1958 in respect to Newark, by the House Un-American Activities Committee or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 177

Whereas in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* (criminal case No. 232-59), pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, directing him to appear as a witness at the Federal Courthouse in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 31st day of May 1960, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled to begin on the 11th day of April 1961; and

Whereas by the privileges of this House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena duces tecum of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor*, but he shall not take with him the papers and records requested in said subpoena; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers, and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of the House of Representatives that the court has found to be material and relevant (except that in no circumstances shall any minutes or transcripts of executive sessions, or any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto, be disclosed or copied) and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the House of Representatives shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST PETER SEEGER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to testify in the case of the *United States of America against Peter Seeger*.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. PETER SEEGER, DEFENDANT, No. C152-240, Cr. 800

TO FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York at the district courthouse, Foley Square, room 318 in the city of New York on the 25th day of January 1960 at 10:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HERBERT A. CHARLSON,
Clerk.

By JOHN S. MAURIELLO,
Deputy Clerk.

Wolf, Popper, Ross, Wolf & Jones, attorneys for defendant.
JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 178) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, to testify at the District Courthouse, Foley Square, in the city of New York, N.Y., on the 25th day of January 1960, in the case of the *United States of America v. Peter Seeger* (criminal case No. C152-240); and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York in the case of *United States of America v. Peter Seeger*; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey to testify in the case of the *United States of America against Harvey O'Connor*.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232-59

TO GORDON H. SCHERER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 1st day of June 1960 at 10 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.,
Clerk.

By MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavis, attorneys for defendant.
MAY 19, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 179) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, a Member of this House, was served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, to testify at the Federal Courthouse in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 1st day of June 1960, in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor*; and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled for trial on the 11th day of April 1961; and

Whereas by the privileges of this House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative GORDON H. SCHERER is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor*; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND T. COLLINS—UNITED STATES AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Raymond T. Collins, an employee of the House, while serving at my direction as an investigator on the Committee on Un-American Activities, received a subpoena directing him to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* (No. 232-59). The return date of the subpoena has been extended by the court to April 11, 1961.

The subpoena in question is transmitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House, in its wisdom, may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232-59

TO RAYMOND T. COLLINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 1st day of June 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.,
Clerk.

H. MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavits, attorneys for defendant.

MAY 19, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 180

Whereas Raymond T. Collins, investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, was served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, to testify at the Federal courthouse, in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 1st day of June 1960, in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* (criminal case No. 232-59); and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled for trial on the 11th day of April 1961: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Raymond T. Collins, investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America v. Harvey O'Connor*; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., an employee of the House, while serving at my direction as counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities, received a subpoena duces tecum directing him to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in the case of the *United States of America v. Martin Popper* (No. 1053-59). The return date of the subpoena has been extended to April 15, 1961.

The portion of the subpoena duces tecum requiring the production of documents was, on the 3d day of February 1961, quashed by Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran.

The subpoena in question is transmitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House, in its wisdom, may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* MARTIN POPPER, DEFENDENT, No. 1053-59
SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

TO FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR.,
Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington on the 7th day of March 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of *United States v. Martin Popper* and bring with you (1) all memoranda in the possession of the said Frank S. Tavenner on June 5, 1959, with respect to the defendant herein, and (2) all communications between the defendant herein and his attorneys on the one hand and the House Committee on Un-American Activities (herein referred to as the committee) and its counsel, staff director and other agents on the other hand, between March 26, 1959, and June 5, 1959, on the subject of the defendant's appearance before the committee and adjournments requested on behalf of the defendant; memoranda made with respect to such communications.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.

By CLARICE FULGHUSEN,
Deputy Clerk.

FEBRUARY 26, 1960.

LEONARD B. BOUDIN,
Attorney for defendant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 181

Whereas Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, was served with a subpoena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, District of Columbia, on the seventh day of March, 1960, in the case of the *United States of America against Martin Popper*, criminal case number 1053-59; and

Whereas the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper is now scheduled for trial on the fifteenth day of April, 1961; and

Whereas Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran did, on the third day of February 1961, quash that portion of the subpoena requiring the production of documents enumerated therein: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena duces tecum of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, as modified by the order of Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran issued on the third day of February, 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate or any special orders, and that the same permission be granted to the Select Subcommittee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HON. CARL VINSON

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America has had her great men—she has had her John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, George Washington, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Jefferson Davis, Stephen Decatur, John Paul Jones, Thomas Edison, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, John Pershing, William Halsey, and George Marshall—to name but a few.

It is not often that men and women of a living generation can observe, in action, truly great Americans who have become a part of our American heritage long before they are ready to become a part of American history.

But here in the House of Representatives there are two great Americans who are now a part of our national heritage and who will also one day be a part of our history for generations yet unborn to honor and revere.

Those two great Americans are SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Very recently the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal published an article entitled "Backstage Boss of the Penta-

gon." It is an article written by a very keen, astute author, Louis Stockstill, who, as a result of his efforts in this remarkable story has earned himself a place of honor among American biographers.

It is not easy to capture the image of CARL VINSON, and it is almost impossible on paper. One must see CARL VINSON in action to understand why he is the most beloved chairman of any committee in the Congress. One must hear CARL VINSON to understand why he is considered to be the most brilliant chairman of any committee in Congress. One must understand CARL VINSON to realize why the legislative proposals that come from the House Armed Services Committee are devoid of political partisanship, blessed almost inevitably with unanimity, and invariably have as their one and only objective, the security of the Nation.

But Lou Stockstill has captured in his article the true character of this truly remarkable man, CARL VINSON. He has been able to put down on paper a closer approximation of the greatness, and also the humbleness of this inimitable American, than has ever heretofore been done.

Mr. Speaker, for 47 years the people of America have been fortunate in having as their representative in the Congress of the United States, CARL VINSON, of Georgia. And I choose my words carefully, "the people of America have as their representative in the Congress" for CARL VINSON represents not just the Sixth District of Georgia, not just the State of Georgia, but the United States of America and all for which she stands.

And the military prowess of this Nation; the aircraft carriers and submarines that sail our seas; the missiles that enter the stratosphere and streak down our ranges; the tanks that roll over the training grounds in Europe and in America; the bombers that constantly guard us in the skies above; and the men and women who operate all of these weapons of war, can look back upon the foresight and wisdom of CARL VINSON and recognize that he, more than any other single person in the world, is responsible for our security, our military might, and our ability to lead the free world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wholeheartedly agree with what the gentleman from South Carolina has said. I had the opportunity and privilege of reading this article carefully. I commend it to the reading of each and every Member of this House because it is most interesting, enlightening, and informative, and a deserved tribute to the great chairman of the finest committee in the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with humbleness, but with pride, because I have been privileged to serve and work closely with CARL VINSON, that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time this fine article about a magnificent American, CARL VINSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, 1961]

"UNCLE CARL" VINSON—BACKSTAGE BOSS OF THE PENTAGON

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

When Robert S. McNamara, 44, was named Secretary of Defense, one of his first moves—a month before he was sworn into office—was to go to Capitol Hill and call on a man who entered Congress 19 months before McNamara was born.

One year earlier, a startled secretary in the U.S. House of Representatives looked up from her desk at 8 o'clock one morning to find McNamara's predecessor standing in the doorway. Former Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., then newly appointed, explained that he had merely stopped by to pay his respects to the young lady's boss. "This is the one place in Washington," Gates said, "where I know I will always get a warm welcome, a good cup of coffee and sound advice."

Such visitors come often to the office of a 77-year-old Georgia farmer, "Uncle CARL" VINSON, ruler of the vital House Armed Services Committee and mastermind of U.S. defense policies since the days of Calvin Coolidge. Top military leaders have always courted his favor with unabashed ardor. For VINSON is the acknowledged backstage boss of the Pentagon.

When President John F. Kennedy lays out his plan for overhauling the Nation's military machine—now eating its way through \$41 billion a year—he too will have to woo this tobacco-chewing teetotaler.

For years I have watched "Uncle Carl" trying to fathom the mysterious magnetism with which he dominates and directs the complicated mass of legislation that determines our military strength. Unquestionably one of the most powerful men in the country, he shuns publicity with toe-in-the-dirt humility. A personality of fascinating contradictions, he can fight furiously for the Armed Forces, but is equally adept at whitewashing pompous admirals and generals down to size.

Behind an outward gruffness that terrifies the uninitiated and cuts through soft soap, I have discovered a rare public servant of unsuspected warmth and humility, a man of the soil who has stayed with his fundamental, time-tested beliefs, never allowing himself to be swayed by each shifting political wind. He has been called a dictator. He is not always right. But over the years he has steered the country through a maze of complexities, conflicts and rivalries to give it what it needs—an adequate defense.

Before the Second World War, he forged a series of giant naval construction programs which brought America eventual world leadership on the seas. Almost 2 years before Pearl Harbor, he battled for funds to train pilots, buy planes and construct airbases for the war to come. In the post-World War II period he demanded a major buildup of strategic bombers and rammed his views through the Congress over the objections of the President. Today, he is fighting for better trained, better equipped troops and increased ballistic missile production to combat communism.

Uncle CARL has tangled with Presidents, Cabinet members and the country's top military brass. One of his hottest fights was with Dwight D. Eisenhower.

When Ike asked Congress for a full-scale reorganization of the Pentagon in 1958, Uncle CARL approved most of the new ground rules, but charged that key provisions of the plan would create a "Prussian general staff." Ike, his blood pressure up, ridiculed this as

"nonsense," but VINSON, supported by both Republicans and Democrats on his committee, stripped the proposal of its "Prussian" features and the House backed him up.

Under White House pressure, the Senate restored some of the authority the President desired, and conferees from the two Armed Services Committees had to meet to decide between the House and Senate versions. The day of the closed-door meeting, VINSON, with members of his committee in tow, arrived at the conference room a few minutes early. When the Senators arrived, led by their chairman, another Georgian, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, VINSON didn't wait for them to find seats. "Well, now, weah all heah," he announced in his cottony Georgia burr. "Now Senatuh RUSSELL will be chaiman of this confereence. You sit heah, Senatuh."

He motioned RUSSELL to a seat and kept talking. "Now, heah's what weah gonna do," Uncle CARL told the group, quickly outlining how the main Senate proposals were to be eliminated.

"Aren't you even going to let us discuss it, CARL?" chuckled Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts.

"Well, now, weah all busy men. We haven't got time fo' a lot of talk," VINSON replied. The discussion lasted about 15 minutes, and Uncle CARL pulled out an already prepared statement explaining what the conference group had done and turned to his chief committee counsel, Robert W. Smart. "Bob," he said, "put Chairman RUSSELL's name on the statement with mine, and eve'yweah it says 'I,' take out 'I' and put in 'We'."

Senator RUSSELL changed only one word.

VINSON's colleagues and the press have seen him conduct similar operations time and again.

In another conference session, when Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington got up to leave before the meeting ended, Uncle CARL fixed him with a penetrating stare. "Where are you going, HENRY?" he asked.

JACKSON explained that some constituents were waiting in his office. "Now, HENRY," Uncle CARL said, in his best father-to-son voice, "nothing is more important than this meeting. You can't go anywhere until we're finished. You sit back down." JACKSON's constituents had to wait.

VINSON gets away with such tactics because of his towering seniority and the vast knowledge and experience he has gained in dealing with the country's military problems through three major wars. He has served in the House 46 years—longer than any man in history except his friend Speaker SAM RAYBURN. For the incredible period of 37 years, he has been the senior Democrat on either the old Naval Affairs Committee or its successor, the Armed Services Committee, and, since 1931, except for two brief periods when Republicans controlled the House, he has been committee chairman. He has sharpened his legislative skills in countless committee sessions and floor fights. He knows instinctively when to press his demands, give ground, or stand firm.

When Presidential defense plans or Pentagon policies fail to meet Uncle CARL's approval, he hauls their advocates before his committee, tears the plans down into their component parts, and rebuilds them with his own do-it-yourself kit. The taxpayer gets a front-line seat to watch the show. One of VINSON's watchwords is "The public has a right to know."

Top Government officials responsible for winning congressional approval of new Armed Forces programs have learned from experience not to wrap their plans in fancy, bureaucratic language for presentation to Uncle CARL. He strips away the frills. "Cut out the hemmin' and hawin'," he tells them, "and get to the point."

Once when the Navy was trying to work out a new pay system, he told the late Fleet

Adm. William D. Leahy (World War II adviser to President Roosevelt) to "keep it all on the back of an envelope so the average layman can understand it."

Although the Senate Armed Services Committee is coequal in every respect with the House group, Uncle CARL's committee takes the lead on defense legislation. The practice stems partly from the fact that Senators serve on a number of committees and can devote less time than VINSON to the exclusive consideration of military matters, and partly from the fact that the House, because it initiates all money bills, has traditionally moved first on most legislation, but Uncle CARL's committee also edges out the Senate group in terms of seniority and experience.

VINSON and the two senior members on his committee (Democrat PAUL KILDAY, of Texas, and House GOP whip LES ARENDS, of Illinois) have completed a combined total of 94 years' congressional service. Uncle CARL was a committee chairman before any of the 17 members of the Senate committee arrived on Capitol Hill. Some Senators who started their service in the House, proudly boast they are "graduates of Vinson College."

On the surface, Uncle CARL looks more like a farmer than a formidable legislator, but the 6-foot Georgian's rustic appearance, slurring accent and occasional mispronunciations (the most famous of which is "Indigo China") mislead inexperienced witnesses who appear before his committee. They learn quickly that VINSON's country-bumpkin guise only thinly camouflages the cunning political acumen which has earned him another nickname—"the Old Fox."

He is a dominating, hard-hitting leader who directs the operations of his 37-member legislative committee (largest on Capitol Hill) under a rigid "no politics" rule. He blasts Republicans or members of his own Democratic Party with equally intense shell-fire if he thinks either group is championing unwise defense policies. He fights zealously for the admirals and generals but keeps them constantly off balance by slamming the door shut on many of their plans. He refuses to give up a proven weapon until he has been shown conclusively that its blueprint replacement will work.

When he says, "Heah's what le's do, and I'll he'p ya," the Pentagon girds for action. If he tells the top brass to hold their "hosses," they pull up short.

Yet, VINSON is not a man who blows his own bugle. Twice the House has attempted to honor him with a special "day on the floor"—a ceremony in which House Members pay tribute to one of their colleagues who has compiled an outstanding record. It is accorded to few, but each time Uncle CARL has been approached on the idea he has flatly rejected it. "I want no day on the floor with kind colleagues making laudatory remarks about me," he says. "My deeds and my actions will have to speak for themselves."

His achievements are indeed awesome, and have earned him such titles as "father of the two-ocean Navy" and "elder statesman of aviation," but his actions sometimes are subject to misinterpretation. When he is called a dictator or the press labels him as "the crusty old Georgian," neither characterization is wholly accurate.

Uncle CARL is a man of contradictions. Some know him as a stern taskmaster, abrupt, demanding, often unapproachable. Others know him as kind, gentle and unassuming; as a playmate for his 10-year-old grandson; as a matchmaker for his employees.

Although he has been a principal architect of American defense policies for 35 years, he ignores the fringe benefits his position offers. He has been in an airplane only three times. He has seldom boarded a Navy war-

ship. Except for a single nearby excursion, he has never been outside the United States.

He is entitled to an \$18,000 retirement salary, but he continues to work, worry and fret over the Nation's military posture.

Some of his most vocal critics charge he gives the Armed Forces everything they want. Many Pentagon officials who see the backstage maneuvering in his office know otherwise.

The late Adm. Ernest J. King once said "Mr. VINSON seems to have a sixth sense which tells him when to support the proposals made to him and when to give us a sound spanking and send us back to the Navy Department." Such spankings are common occurrences.

During the last Congress, a top Defense Department official who had incurred Uncle CARL's displeasure (and that of numerous other congressional leaders) resigned his high-ranking post after VINSON bluntly told the Secretary of Defense: "We can't work with him. Don't send him back over here again."

The President appointed a new man to the job. Pentagon leaders waited anxiously to see if he would be more acceptable. In his first get together with Uncle CARL—who has no use for the ambiguous language and circumlocutions which are the trademark of politics—the newcomer was told: "Now, I don't want to say anything derogatory about your predecessor, but I just want to say that no matter what kind of job you do, it will be a better job than your predecessor did."

Uncle CARL often kills off Pentagon plans before they can get up a full head of steam. Even personal friendships are not permitted to stand in the way of his conscience.

When Eisenhower named Adm. Arthur W. Radford to the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, VINSON sent Radford a rare congratulatory message. Radford telegraphed back to say he would "continue to count heavily" on Uncle CARL's "advice and guidance." He noted that without VINSON's "friendship, counsel and advice over these many years, yesterday's announcement would never have been made."

Four years later, when the Defense Department sent up a trial balloon on an unprecedented third term for Radford to see how VINSON would react, he told them, "I see no reason to perpetuate any individual in the office."

Although the Senate has exclusive power to confirm or deny Presidential appointments, Uncle CARL's statement foreclosed any further consideration for his old friend; Air Force Gen. Nathan F. Twining was nominated instead.

When the Army decided, as an economy measure, to substitute motorized hearses for the 17 horses used in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery, VINSON reared up in instant protest.

"If we can afford State dinners and the expenses always associated with the visits of foreign dignitaries," he declared, "we can afford to retain some small semblance of the respect this Nation still possesses for the few military personnel who are carried to their last resting place on a caisson."

Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker abruptly withdrew the plan.

Another official who stumbled and fell in a row with Uncle CARL was former Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson. Without consulting Congress, Wilson decided to transfer all officers of the Veterinary Corps to the Department of Agriculture. Uncle CARL reminded Wilson that no service function can be shifted or altered without approval of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees (a law which VINSON wrote). And, he added, approval in this case was not likely in view of the valuable work being done by veterinarians in military research.

Wilson refused to back down but was afraid to go ahead. He let the matter hang

fire until he was ready to resign his Pentagon post and go back to private industry. Then, as one of his last official acts, he signed the transfer order and scuttled out of Washington. His successor, Neil H. McElroy, immediately delayed the order, and killed it a few days later.

In recent months, the Army, alarmed over ramifications of a Defense Department order drastically curtailing one of its essential training programs, turned to Uncle CARL for help. A ranking Army official explained that the action was taken without Army approval, although his was the only service seriously affected. VINSON called in Pentagon chiefs and asked, "Why?" This brought a peeved reaction from one official that the Army was trying to undercut him by going to VINSON.

Not one to split hairs, Uncle CARL replied, "Well, now, that's right. The Army is trying to undercut you. And the Defense Department, of course, is trying to undercut the Army. And now," he added without further ado, "I'm undercutting the Defense Department."

When he was chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, every time a Secretary of the Navy retired, resigned, or died, Uncle CARL's name popped into the news as a probable successor. He said repeatedly he didn't aspire to this honor. Once he remarked, "I've got more than I can say grace over right here."

Old-timers on Capitol Hill remember when VINSON used to refer to Cabinet members as "the best (or worst) Secretary of the Navy I ever had."

Although he has spurned such honors, himself, Uncle CARL has had a hand in the selection of many Defense Department leaders. Admiral Leahy, in his book, "I Was There," recalls that he was with President Roosevelt in South Carolina when word came on April 28, 1944, of the death of Navy Secretary Frank Knox. "Among the first callers after my return to Washington," he said, "was Representative CARL VINSON, who recommended that I urge the President to appoint the Under Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, to the Cabinet post." Forrestal's nomination went to the Senate in May. Later he became the first Secretary of Defense.

Following creation of the Defense Department, VINSON also has been rumored under consideration for appointment as Defense Secretary. At the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, reporters asked if he would accept the appointment. "Of course not," he said, "I'd rather run the Pentagon from up here."

Laws VINSON writes for the armed services consistently win quick endorsement. In 29 years he has lost only three floor fights on bills reported by his committee.

The first defeat was on a pre-Pearl Harbor proposal to fortify Guam. Those who voted against Uncle CARL do not brag about their Pyrrhic victory.

The only other defeats were on bills to raise military pay (later approved) and to establish universal military training.

Veteran Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, says it is treason to vote against anything VINSON proposes. While not comparing VINSON's operations "with those carried on in Russia," he says "they are just about as effective."

Uncle CARL's power is pointed up, too, in numerous White House communiques in which ex-Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower have wooed his support, sought his advice, or praised him for unsolicited assistance.

While most Congressmen have difficulty wangling a White House appointment, one of the Roosevelt letters (April 29, 1939) clearly shows the type of entree enjoyed by VINSON. F.D.R., discussing a prospective Navy law with Uncle CARL, ended his letter by

penning an appeal in longhand: "Do please come talk over with me this personnel problem—I get back May 2."

F.D.R. and VINSON were members of a mutual admiration society, each praising the other's role in the growth of the Navy. Nevertheless, Uncle CARL once overruled Roosevelt during a critical period of history.

When VINSON became a member of the old Naval Affairs Committee, F.D.R. was Assistant Secretary of the Navy (then the second-ranking civilian slot), and the two had an early opportunity to assess each other's capabilities. As a result, they later formed a close working relationship in matters of national defense.

When Roosevelt was elevated to the White House, Uncle CARL conferred with him at Warm Springs before his inauguration. He told reporters F.D.R. knew more about the Navy and its needs than any man who had entered the White House since Teddy Roosevelt. When one newsman asked, "What makes you think so?" Uncle CARL replied: "I don't think so. Because I know it."

When President Truman ousted Gen. Douglas MacArthur, VINSON, never afraid to wade into the middle of a controversy, applauded the action even though the tide of public sentiment was running heavily against the Chief Executive. VINSON said MacArthur's policies, if carried out, would have involved the United States in full-scale war in the Orient. He softened his criticism by noting that it was only human that a person who remained for so long a time in one area of the world would come to the conclusion that that area outweighs in importance all other regions of the world. MacArthur had been in the Pacific for 14 years.

The day after Uncle CARL's statement (April 12, 1951), Truman wrote, "I can't tell you how very much I appreciate your wholehearted support. I, of course, had counted on the fact that you would understand that the policy at stake is civilian control of the military."

The quick official notice of VINSON's action shows how important it was to the Chief Executive to have Uncle CARL in his corner. Earlier VINSON had tangled with Truman over military budget cuts which preceded the Korean war and had played an important role in forcing the resignation of Truman's Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

Although Uncle CARL has no official part in writing the big appropriations bills for the Armed Forces, his actions often ward off increases or reductions in the defense budget as well as other important money measures. As Eisenhower was preparing to leave for the summit conference in May 1960, he asked VINSON to keep him posted if the mutual security appropriations bill became imperiled. "If in your judgment this situation is beginning to go badly during my attendance at the summit meetings," he wrote, "I hope you will send me any suggestions you might have as to what I could additionally do to be helpful."

The letter, like many others from Eisenhower to VINSON, begins, "Dear Uncle CARL" and is signed "D.E."

During the earlier Pentagon reorganization fight, however, Ike became coldly formal. When VINSON's bill was reported out of committee, the President, in a letter beginning, "My Dear Mr. Chairman" and signed "Dwight D. Eisenhower," complimented VINSON on his work but suggested some changes in the bill.

When the fight was over—possibly to save face, and possibly to restore peace with Uncle CARL, Ike announced that the final measure adequately met all of his recommendations. Off went another "Dear Uncle CARL" letter in which the President said he hoped VINSON was "proud of the end result; you have every right to be, in my opinion, and I am greatly appreciative to you for all that you did to

make possible the desired result." This time the letter was signed, "With warm regard, sincerely, D.D.E."

During VINSON's congressional service, eight presidents have resided in the White House, Uncle CARL has said goodbye to 18 Secretaries of War and Defense, 24 Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force, three Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (a relatively new post) and 52 admirals and generals who have headed the land, sea and ground forces. A battalion of sub-secretaries and senior officers in other major assignments also have passed in and out of defense planning posts.

This is one of Uncle CARL's great strengths. He has been in the forefront of national defense planning far longer than his closest rival. He was a towering figure on the national scene when most of today's senior officers still were worrying about promotion in the junior ranks.

Not one of the Navy's present four-star admirals had entered the Naval Academy when Uncle CARL came to Washington. All seven—including the Navy's highest ranking officer—were lieutenants (some junior grade) when VINSON became chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

When VINSON was elected to Congress in 1914, the JCS Chairman, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, was 15; Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, and Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, were 13; Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George Decker, was 12, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, was only 9.

VINSON has watched thousands of young men enter the Military and Naval Academies, rise through the ranks and retire. Some of his own appointees have spanned two generations. Midshipman Charles Leighton Moore III, a current Annapolis plebe, and his father, Capt. C. I. Moore, commanding officer of the Barbers Point Naval Air Station in Hawaii, both entered the Naval Academy under VINSON's banner.

Uncle CARL's own preeminent role in defense planning began before America entered the First World War (for which he voted), and before his appointment to Naval Affairs.

On May 27, 1916, the House was angrily fighting over the Navy budget, which included a \$160 million shipbuilding program. This amount, which would not buy half a nuclear carrier today, was at that time the largest such program ever proposed by the Government.

Some House Members thought it was not enough. Others thought it was too much. Democrats charged that Republicans had sent the Navy into stormy seas. Republicans said the Navy's plight was the fault of the Democrats.

In the midst of the tumult, VINSON, then 32, arose to make his first speech on the subject of military preparedness. Swiftly, he hammered out the two basic philosophies which have guided him throughout his almost half a century of congressional service: A nation can maintain peace only if its defenses are strong, and preparedness "is a nonpartisan question." He said "my country and its safety comes ahead of any party."

These views are now espoused by all politicians, regardless of party, but VINSON, unlike some others, has given them deeper meaning by never deviating from either concept in the fights he has waged to strengthen America throughout his 46 years in the Congress. He has unhesitatingly cut down any and all who have attempted to bar or weaken U.S. military progress.

Today, the Nation is spending \$41 billion of its \$75 billion budget for military preparedness and another \$3.7 billion for mutual security. About \$20 billion of next year's military outlay will require specific authorizing legislation from VINSON's committee.

The biggest remaining chunk will go to programs already authorized by his committee, which, together with its Senate counterpart, writes all major laws affecting the organization of the Armed Forces, as well as pay, promotion, retirement, medical care, and countless other aspects of service life.

VINSON's committee carries the most impressive workload on Capitol Hill, completing action annually on recordbreaking numbers of bills, some of which the Senate never finds time to consider. In the last 4 years alone, 198 bills have been approved by the VINSON group. Of these, 194 have passed the House and 149 have been approved by the Senate and signed into law.

Uncle CARL's driving force is largely responsible for the enormous output, but it also contributes to the often repeated charge that he is a dictator. He allows for no nonsense in getting his work behind him. He loads his subcommittee chairmen with major projects and constantly prods them to greater and greater efforts, pushing himself equally as hard.

His fellow workers do not deny that he sometimes ramrods his views through the committee, but they insist (and his record verifies) that he is a master of compromise and not a dictator. He seems to sense opposition before it develops, and moves to break it up before it gathers momentum. If the outcry flames to high, he quickly concedes just enough to bring the fire under control.

VINSON readily admits he does not always give the committee unlimited time for the consideration of every problem, but maintains that to do so would hopelessly ensnarl the group in consideration of minutiae more properly left up to the officials who must enforce the laws.

"Why, if you wanted to," he contends, "you could spend hours discussing the extension of an aircraft runway. You have to have some faith in the people who propose these things. They are trying to achieve the same result for America which we are trying to achieve. If a runway has to be a hundred feet longer, it has to be."

Once, when the Air Force thought it had just about convinced VINSON of the necessity for extending a runway at a Georgia airbase, an official disclosed that a Negro cemetery would have to be moved to make way for the project. VINSON turned thumbs down. "We already have enough trouble with civil rights," he said, "without going around moving the dead."

Runway extensions are only one of thousands of items which VINSON's committee must consider annually in a single bill—the military construction program. Even without devoting hours of study to an isolated project, this one measure requires several weeks of hearings.

Those who watch VINSON rushing a bill through the committee often overlook, or are unaware of the fact, that most of the major legislation previously has been farmed out to a subcommittee which has examined the subject in great detail over a period of days, weeks, or months. Once the subcommittee has completed its work, VINSON normally accepts its recommendations with few questions. He expects the same of others. If the subject is reopened to prolonged debate, he believes members of the full committee are certain to waste valuable time retracing the same circuitous route followed by the subcommittee.

Uncle CARL impatiently declines to replot the same ground whenever he can avoid it. This has made him a master of the bum's rush in dealing with witnesses before his committee. If testimony proves unproductive, or unnecessarily repetitious, the "old fox" empties the witness chair in a hurry.

When Senator CLAIR ENGLE of California was a House Member, he appeared to testify before VINSON's committee and made the

mistake of remarking that a previous witness had covered the subject matter so thoroughly, he doubted there was much he could add. Unwittingly, he had opened a wedge for Uncle CARL.

"Thank you very much, Congressman, for being so considerate of the committee's time," VINSON cracked. He banged his gavel and ordered, "Next witness."

Ability to control testimony is one of the most essential assets of a congressional chairman. One reason is that Capitol Hill is overrun with professional witnesses, who spend their days trying to tell Congress how to run the country.

One lady—who is in and out of the Capitol as often as House Doorkeeper "Fishbait" Miller—persuaded VINSON to give her 10 minutes to talk to the committee about the Draft Act. When her turn came, she unfolded an impressive sheaf of notes, and began a rapid-fire recitation. Five minutes elapsed and VINSON banged his gavel. "Your time has run out," he said.

The lady was indignant. "I was supposed to talk 10 minutes," she protested.

Uncle CARL peered down at the witness from his lofty seat. "You talk so fast," he said, "You put an awful heap in the 5 minutes."

Tourists who prowl through the Halls of Congress at the rate of 18,000 a day are attracted to other big, klieg-lighted hearings which are beamed to TV audiences, but seldom visit Uncle CARL's magnificent chambers. Those who do stray in are often treated to one of the best shows on Capitol Hill. The press laughingly maintain that "someone should sell tickets."

VINSON operates almost in anonymity as far as the general public is concerned. Although the Armed Forces would fight each other for the privilege of transporting him to any of the Nation's farflung bases, he seldom ventures more than a few hundred miles from Washington or Georgia.

During the Roosevelt administration, F.D.R. occasionally persuaded Uncle CARL to join him on an inspection trip—provided it was not too far away. But, except for a quick official visit to naval installations in the Caribbean early in his career, he has never been outside the United States. His longest trip was a 1919 visit to the west coast.

The most recent one was in June 1957 when he went to Norfolk, Va., to observe the first international naval review to be held in American waters in 50 years. With typical disdain for the honors which the services are eager to accord him, he gave no official notice that he was coming. He took an unimportant seat far from the other dignitaries, and, to the chagrin of Navy brass, ate with the enlisted men.

Beneath his gruff exterior, VINSON is basically shy and retiring. He is intensely discomfited when anyone pays him too much attention. He shuns the public spotlight and turns down all invitations except those to White House functions (he looks on these as command performances).

A witness before his committee once suggested he had met Uncle CARL at a cocktail party. "I haven't been to one in 10 years," VINSON said, "I am too wise a bird to be going to cocktail parties." That was 11 years ago. His record is still intact.

A man of frugal habits and moderate tastes, he prefers plain to fancy food, chews 15-cent plug tobacco (in the privacy of his spittoon-equipped office), and smokes mild, 10-cent cigars. When a Macon friend, W. T. Anderson, once offered him a more expensive cigar, he declined. Friends would not always be around to keep him supplied, he said, and he did not want to cultivate a taste for something he could not afford.

While Congress is in session, he lives a life of quiet seclusion in a Washington suburb, Chevy Chase, Md. His home (a

political foe once told Georgians it was "a magnificent Maryland mansion") is a modest, six-room bungalow purchased in 1922 soon after his marriage.

He shares it with "Till" and Mollie Snead and their two sons, Tillman, 10, and Carl, 5 months. Mrs. Vinson died in 1950. They had no children.

Till, an assistant in VINSON's congressional office for almost 25 years, met Mollie, formerly a professional nurse, while she was caring for Mrs. Vinson. Although their new son is VINSON's namesake, 10-year-old Tillman, who had a big head start, is Uncle CARL's pride and joy. He calls VINSON "grandpa." Devoted CARL calls him "my partner."

The two share a lively interest in sports, hold heated debates about athletic records, go to movies together (Tillman's choice), watch TV shoot-'em-ups, and sometimes charge through the house in a wild game of cops and robbers.

Tillman follows Uncle CARL's congressional activities with keen interest. When VINSON hits the headlines, Tillman grabs the newspapers and rushes out to show his friends "what my grandpa did." If some official becomes entangled in a knotty problem, Tillman wants to know why it hasn't been turned over to "grandpa" to solve.

Uncle CARL often takes the boy to his office on a quiet afternoon or Saturday morning when there is no urgent House or committee business. When Tillman was younger, the two sometimes spent hours in the imposing two-story committee chambers (empty except for them) and the lad, occupying VINSON's high, throne-like seat, backed by colorful flags and flowing draperies, gavelled imaginary meetings into order. VINSON, sitting attentively below in the big witness chair where such men as Nimitz and Eisenhower have listened to his own sage council, answered questions put to him by "Chairman Snead."

When the boy was 8, VINSON made an appointment with the Secretary of Defense, completely forgetting his promise to watch Tillman in a Christmas school play the same day. When he remembered at the last moment, an aide hurriedly telephoned the Pentagon to call off the meeting with the Cabinet member. No one ever told the Secretary of Defense he had been outranked by a third-grader.

When his leisure time in Washington is not occupied with Tillman, Uncle CARL keeps busy in numerous other ways. An early riser (5 to 6 a.m.), he is seated in his front-porch rocker when the carrier boy arrives with the Washington Post. If the boy oversleeps or is delayed, Uncle CARL wants to know what kept him.

He escapes the rush-hour traffic by leaving home in his second-hand, 1952 Ford, with his assistant, Till, at the wheel (he has never learned to drive), in time to arrive at his office by 7:30 each weekday. He frequently also goes to his office on Sunday.

He spends at least 9 hours at his desk, in committee meetings and on the House floor (longer if necessary) and returns to Chevy Chase around 5 p.m., for his usual evening at home. When Till is away and there is no one to drive the car, he climbs aboard a streetcar or bus packed with Government clerks and secretaries. He seldom uses a taxi.

An omnivorous reader, he wades through three daily newspapers (the Post, the Washington Evening Star, and the New York Times; or, in Georgia, the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta Journal, and Macon Telegraph), the weekly news magazines, biographies, histories, murder mysteries, "just about anything I get my hands on." He reads the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal as soon as it reaches his desk each week, and has said: "There are other service publications, but the Journal is the one everyone reads."

At home, he also devotes many of his evening hours to careful study of committee reports and other official documents. "I have to read every report," he says, "and cut out some of the material, just like an editor. Certain things weaken reports. We are not in the business of selling headlines. We are trying to write legislation that will benefit the Nation."

When he makes one of his rare public speeches (perhaps four in the past 5 years), he closets himself in his room (furnished with spartan simplicity; bed, chest of drawers, night table, and rocker) to practice its delivery on young Tillman.

He takes daily walks to keep in trim. Often he ranges as much as 2 miles, stopping to chat with neighbors and offer friendly (not always effectual) advice on gardening problems. If he encounters a house for sale, he ducks in, makes a quick inspection, finds out the asking price, if possible, and decides on the spot if it is "wo'th" the money.

If one of his employees buys a new home, Uncle CARL frequently makes an unannounced visit to look it over and give his appraisal. He believes one of the few ways a man on a salary can get ahead in life is to obligate himself to buy either property or securities, preferably both. If a staffer is not a homeowner, VINSON constantly prods him in that direction.

He takes lively interest in his employees, talks to them about their families, and after-work diversions, and tells them newsy tidbits about his own activities. If illness keeps a staff member at home, Uncle CARL institutes an immediate investigation. Has the staffer been to see a doctor? What did the doctor say? What medicines did he prescribe? One of the staff tracks down the information. If the illness is prolonged, the inquiries continue daily.

Most of VINSON's employees (3 in his congressional office; 15 on the committee staff) have been with him for more than 5 years, a number for 10 or more, and some for periods ranging as high as 20 or 25 years. His present secretary, Mrs. Marguerite Maddux Phillips, has completed 20 years in Uncle CARL's office. His former secretary, Miss Edna L. Lytle, was there for 30 years before she retired.

Although he can be abrupt and demanding, when the workload is heavy, he is more often warm and friendly in his relationship with his staff. He detours through their offices to talk with them, and to listen to and advise them on their personal problems. At the beginning of each Congress he herds the committee staff into the first meeting and introduces them to new committee members as the best staff on Capitol Hill.

He has even acted as "matchmaker" on a few occasions.

In 1955, he decided that an attractive secretary in his congressional office (Mary Ellen Williams) and one of the lawyers on his committee staff (Charles F. (Duke) Duncander, now chief counsel of the House Space Committee) would make a good pair. He launched a campaign to throw them together. After weeks of thwarted attempts to interest the couple in each other, he took dramatic action. Calling both of them into his office, he arranged, over their amused but embarrassed objections, for Mary Ellen to invite Duke to her home for dinner. He set a specific date. Before the dinner took place, he gave Mary Ellen detailed instructions about what to serve: "Now you're a southern girl and Duke's a southern boy. You just fix him some fried chicken, and make him some biscuits." The first dinner was launched in an uneasy atmosphere, but the couple soon found they were genuinely attracted to each other. In 8 months, they were married.

Summers, after Congress adjourns, Uncle CARL escapes to the open air and sunshine. When his colleagues head for Paris or Tokyo

at the end of a tiring session, he goes back to Milledgeville, Ga. (population 11,107), and his farm.

Asked why he hasn't traveled more, he replies, "I don't have time to travel. I have plenty of business to tend to on my farm and in my district. The best vacation I can get is right here on the farm. I need no days free of responsibility."

Even in Washington, VINSON "runs" the farm. At the beginning of each week he dictates a letter to his "overseer," Barney Collins, instructing him what to do for the next 7 days. A weekly reply from Barney tells Uncle CARL what has been accomplished or what, because of inclement weather or other unforeseen problems, has had to be postponed.

The farm—River Ridge Plantation, located on Vinson Highway about a 2-minute drive from Milledgeville's city limits—covers 601.1 acres of rolling, gracefully cultivated land. Once, together with an adjoining tract owned by VINSON's father, it comprised more than 1,500 acres and was the top cotton producer in the county. He bought the farm in 1926 "because my district is a farming district and I decided I ought to learn something about agriculture." Today, after an unsuccessful fight with the boll weevil, the cotton has been replaced by white-faced cattle and feed crops.

VINSON has neither a secretary nor an office in his home district ("My office is under my hat"). When he is at the farm he keeps up a heavy load of paperwork at a roll-top desk on his back porch. Correspondence which requires his personal attention is dispatched from Capitol Hill daily, both by his office and committee staffs. After he has read and studied it, he scribbles his instructions in the margin and sends it back.

This work, combined with his supervision of the farm, is dovetailed into the many hours he devotes each week to constituents who come to the farm to discuss problems. One Milledgeville resident says, "Some of the local people think if they lose a cow, CARL can find it for them."

Not typical of the problems, but amusing in its resolution, is a request made by Jere Moore, editor of the Milledgeville Union Recorder. Searching for a speaker for the annual chamber of commerce banquet, Moore called Uncle CARL and suggested the commander of the Navy's atomic submarine, *Nautilus*. Uncle CARL flatly said, "Why you can't get him."

"I told him," Moore says, "the officer had been to Savannah to speak and it was a pretty pass if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee couldn't get him for his own hometown." Uncle CARL said, "He'll be there." He was.

VINSON has lived at the farm (in a spacious, white-frame farmhouse he originally built for his overseer) only for the past 10 years. He also owns a historic, 128-year-old Milledgeville "town house." Its handsomely furnished rooms have stood unused (but carefully maintained) since Mrs. Vinson's death in 1950.

Very little has ever been disclosed about VINSON's boyhood, youth, and early manhood. To him, these are "unimportant" phases of his life, in which "no one is interested."

For years, the editors of *Who's Who* have had to write their sketchy biographies about him from other sources. When he receives a questionnaire he tosses it into the wastebasket.

If an interviewer insists on talking about his early life, he admonishes, "Well, now, you'll ruin your story if you clutter it up with all of that. Why don't you just stick to the record in Congress."

Justifiably proud of his record in the Congress, he would prefer to forget the 6-year-old who liked to tell Bible stories, the teenager

who sold newspapers and jerked sodas to earn money for his education, and the young State legislator who planned "the battle of the Bloody Tenth."

VINSON was born November 18, 1883, on a farm in Baldwin County, Ga., 3 miles south of Milledgeville, the former State capital (1807-1868).

Before he reached school age, his parents, Edward Story and Annie Morris Vinson, moved into town so CARL and their seven other children could attend the Middle Georgia Military and Agricultural College. The school (now Georgia Military College) was located in the old State capitol building. It taught both sexes and all grades, beginning with the first.

CARL's sister, Leila (Mrs. M. J. Guyton, of Dublin, Ga.), says CARL made an early impression at the college. "Every night after supper Papa would call all of us around the fireplace and tell Bible stories. After awhile, CARL got to the point where he would plead, 'Papa, let me tell. Let me tell.' CARL was a great storyteller. By the time he entered GMC, he knew many Bible stories by heart." When his first-grade teacher at GMC, Miss Carrie Fair, learned about CARL's precocity, she insisted on giving him prominent billing in the chapel programs.

The chapel, prophetically, was the old legislative assembly hall of the former State capitol building. As a part of his public speaking, CARL recalls that he later "had to speak there every Friday afternoon." (A great-uncle had preceded him in the historic chamber as a representative of the Georgia Legislature.)

Although the Vinsons lived in town from the time of CARL's earliest memories, his father continued to operate the farm. As the children grew, Papa Vinson, a firm disciplinarian who believed success is achieved only through toil, gave his sons a choice—they could help him on the farm or they could find summer jobs in Milledgeville. CARL elected to stay in town.

For a time he jerked sodas in the Culver & Kidd drugstore. Leila says the drugstore "didn't pay him much but CARL liked the job because he got to eat all of the ice cream and drink all of the sodawater he wanted."

Later, he obtained the newspaper agency for the Atlanta Journal. "I had all of Milledgeville—about 300 papers. They came in on the 8 o'clock train from Atlanta, and I had other boys, sometimes my brothers, who helped out. The paper cost 10 cents a week. I got 5 cents for delivering it and had to give the Journal 5 cents."

He also worked in two local department stores: P. J. Cline's and Joseph's. At Joseph's (now the Union Department Store), he earned \$5 a month as cash boy. When sales were completed, salesladies turned over the customer's money to CARL who sprinted to the cash desk and brought back the receipt and change. Later, he was promoted to bundle wrapper at \$15 a month. In his free time at the department store, his friend Judge Erwin Sibley recalls, "CARL cornered the other boys in the cellar and made speeches to them."

After school, and on weekends, the Vinson home at the corner of Montgomery and Clark Streets was the gathering place for many of the town's young people.

"CARL was the ringleader," Leila says. "We had to do what he said. He was the boss."

The young friends played croquet and baseball and other games. Sometimes, the Vinson's had watermelon cuttings with as many as 15 to 25 guests in an afternoon.

Leila says, "We had a big yard, which was one reason our home was a gathering place, but another was that Papa would bring fruit home from the farm—watermelon, cantaloup, peaches, apples—and Mama baked cakes. She always had lots of cakes and cookies for us to serve."

By some standards, the Vinsons might have been considered poor, Leila says, "but none of us ever knew it. We always seemed to have so much of everything, and Papa saw to it that we all got good educations."

Leila remembers that "CARL was always popular, but he was never a ladies man. He was so busy studying and working and trying to make money that he never had time for anything else."

By 1900 CARL had saved enough, together with help from his father, to enroll at the Mercer University law school in Macon. He doesn't recall what attracted him to the legal profession. "I just decided, like most boys do, that I wanted to be a lawyer."

One day he went to see County Judge Edward R. Hines, junior partner in a local law firm. "I just went up there, and told him I wanted to study law." Judge Hines owned a substantial law library. He agreed to let CARL use his books. Sometimes CARL read at the office, other times he took books home.

The reading eased his initial studies at Mercer when he began the serious task of earning his law degree. In 1902 he was graduated (29th in a class of 50) and simultaneously admitted to the bar. One of his classmates was the late E. E. Cox, also destined to be a U.S. Representative from Georgia, and, eventually, the ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee. His niece, Mildred Cox, works in VINSON's office.

Returning to Milledgeville, 18-year-old CARL learned that Judge Hines' law partner had died. He stepped into the firm as junior member, and a new shingle—"Hines and Vinson"—went on display.

The practice of law in Milledgeville, then a town of about 4,000, was not a booming enterprise. The new partners devoted much of their time to the preparation of deeds and wills, drawing contracts, and similar routine. CARL recalls, "We took anything that came along. Just as a country doctor accepts any patient who comes in, country lawyers don't specialize. If they did, they wouldn't have much business."

Always one to keep busy ("Man is made to wear out, not rust out," he says), CARL soon found his law practice didn't give him enough to do. In 1904, he won appointment as Baldwin County court solicitor. When he was reappointed to a second term, the Milledgeville Union Recorder (August 5, 1907) complimented him on his great success as a prosecuting attorney. Four years in the post pointed the way to his first venture into politics.

At 25, he ran for and was elected to the Georgia General Assembly. While the legislature was in session—50 days out of each year—he lived at the old Kimball House in Atlanta and drew a salary of \$7 a day, most of which was eaten up by living expenses.

But while the financial reward was nonexistent, service in the legislature broadened his knowledge of practical politics and soon earned him a reputation as a hard-working, bright young man. In his second term, at the age of 27, the assembly recognized his abilities by making him speaker pro tempore. An old newspaper relates that "Whenever he presided, this Apollo Belvedere presented an imposing and impressive presence."

Additionally, and even more important to his career, the 1911-12 term of the Georgia General Assembly enabled CARL to draw up an intricate battle plan which was to catapult him into the U.S. Congress and eventual national prominence.

Following the 1910 census, the assembly faced the difficult task of redistricting. The young lawyer from Milledgeville had definite ideas about his own Baldwin County. He wangled an appointment on the reapportionment committee and did some fast talking. When the redistricting dust settled, surprised Baldwinites found they had been chopped from the Sixth District and dumped into

one of the hottest battlegrounds in the State—"the Bloody Tenth."

The old Sixth District, of which Baldwin County had been a part, had for many years been dominated by Bibb County, which held the district's largest city—Macon—and a goodly share of the total district population. Bibb was only one county removed from Baldwin, and CARL, who already had his eye on Washington, doubted that he would be able to penetrate very deeply into Bibb's heavy fortifications in a bid for the Sixth District congressional seat.

The 10th District presented at least a fighting chance, he reasoned. It, too, was dominated by a heavily populated county (Richmond, with the city of Augusta), and had been the scene of some of the State's bloodiest battles. But it offered one advantage. Baldwin was at the far end of the district from Richmond and it might be possible to convince some of Baldwin's neighboring counties to dig out from under the shadow of Augusta.

CARL's hope was that he could win his own county, the three neighboring counties, and, perhaps, a majority of four others not bordering on Richmond. It was a long shot, but he was convinced the odds were less heavily weighted than they would have been in a fight with Bibb.

Only one factor had been overlooked. Baldwinites, perhaps angered by being shifted to the Bloody Tenth, refused to send CARL back to the general assembly for a third term. He lost his reelection bid (the only political defeat he has ever suffered at the hands of the voters) by five ballots.

Undismayed, he turned to the Governor and obtained an appointment as judge of the Baldwin County court. Meanwhile, he watched developments in his new congressional district, hopeful that he could soon test his carefully drawn battle plan. The wait was shorter than expected.

On February 14, 1914, Georgia's senior Senator, Augustus Octavius Bacon, died. Representative Thomas W. Hardwick, of the 10th District, made a bid for the vacant Senate seat. The scramble was on for a successor to Hardwick.

CARL announced his candidacy for the U.S. House of Representatives, and in a rented model-T Ford, with a hired driver at the wheel, set out to stump the district.

Miss Martha Thomas, then a stenographer at Hines & Vinson and later CARL's first secretary in Washington, says "Most people didn't think he had a chance of being elected. He had three opponents, all wealthy men."

Vinson had little money with which to wage his campaign. His staff totaled three people: Miss Thomas, a campaign manager (the late Dave Howard), and the driver of the model-T. What he lacked in funds and assistants had to be compensated for with a whirlwind of energy. On the campaign trail as much as 20 hours a day, he soon was a familiar figure at every district schoolhouse or crossroads where he could pull together a handful of people to listen to his views.

By the time the campaign was drawing to a close, he was in debt. He owed the bank and he owed his printers. But when the polls closed and the votes were counted, all but 4 of the district's 12 counties were in the Vinson column.

CARL's father, who had always said his son "inherited his brains from his mother and his brawn from me," looked back on the long, hard campaign trail and told CARL, "this time it was your brawn that paid off."

As a result of the immediate House vacancy created by Hardwick's elevation to the Senate, CARL was elected to both the unexpired term in the 63d Congress and to the new term in the 64th. On November 3, 1914, 15 days before his 31st birthday, he walked onto the House floor and was sworn in as the country's youngest Congressman.

Miss Thomas recalls that he was "not at all excited" about his new post and settled into it without fanfare. "We moved into former Congressman Hardwick's office," she says, "and got right down to work."

During the 4 years she spent in Washington, Miss Thomas "never caught up with the work." The 10th District's new Representative opened his office early and closed it late. Miss Thomas remembers "one night another Congressman came by our door, looked in, and said, 'You mean to tell me you are still working? When are you going to go home?' Mr. VINSON's reply was, 'When we get through.'"

Letters leaving the office had to be as nearly perfect as possible, and they had to clearly reflect CARL's views. This is a requirement he still demands today. If one of his letters is read 40 or 50 years after it is written, he hopes no one will have to be ashamed of what it says.

When Miss Thomas took her first paid Government vacation from the Congressman's office, after obtaining a replacement stenographer, she went to visit friends who lived in the country near Washington. At the end of 3 days "A hack came driving up and the driver told me Mr. VINSON had sent for me. He said it was urgent."

Her first thought was that perhaps CARL was sick. She packed quickly, climbed into the hack and rushed back to the city. In the office, she found the Congressman looking as healthy as ever, but unhappy. "What's wrong?" she asked.

CARL pointed to a stack of unsigned letters. "I've had three stenographers since you left," he said. "Look at those letters. There's not a letter there I could send out."

Miss Thomas took off her coat and went to work. It was the last she ever heard of her vacation.

Not long after his arrival in the Capital, an influential constituent sent CARL drafts of a number of bills he wanted introduced. Most Members of Congress honor such requests with alacrity. CARL, with equal alacrity, sent the proposals back to their author, Miss Thomas recalls. When he was warned he might be creating a powerful enemy, his reply was characteristic. "I wear no man's collar," he said.

In his new office, CARL found only small initial improvement in his finances. Out of his salary (Congressmen received \$625 a month in 1914), he had to pay Miss Thomas, take care of the postage expenses of his office, start settling his campaign debts, spend \$90 a month for a room (at the Burlington Hotel) and buy all of his meals.

When congressional salaries were boosted to \$22,500, 42 years later, he ad libbed to friends, "Well, if they are going to pay that kind of money in Congress, I think I'll make a career out of it." Today, entitled to an \$18,000 retirement salary any time he wants to take advantage of it, he actually works for several thousand dollars less than he earned in 1914. A replacement would cost the taxpayers \$40,500.

The folks back home soon began to voice pride in CARL's work. When he had been in Congress only 13 months, the Marietta Courier (many miles outside VINSON's district) urged its readers to keep their eyes on the gifted statesman from the 10th. CARL, the Courier reported, "is working like a farmer * * * determined to reflect credit upon his section of the country. * * * People outside Georgia already are asking about him."

A year later, a 1917 Georgia newspaper relates, a Russian "with outrageous whiskers and large clumping feet" appeared in one of the 10th District courts to seek his U.S. citizenship papers. When the judge asked him, "How is the President of the United States elected?" the Russian's reply threw the court into a paroxysm of laughter. "By

the Democratic Party," he said. The answer probably erased all doubts about the immigrant's eligibility for citizenship, but if any remained they soon were dispelled. The next question, who is "the greatest man in the country?" brought the immediate reply: "The Honorable CARL VINSON, Representative from this district."

As his popularity grew at home, VINSON soon began waging another popularity contest in Washington. This time it was not aimed at the voters, but at a young lady from New Philadelphia, Ohio—Mary Green MacGregor. On April 6, 1921, they were married at Washington's Foundry Methodist Church.

Capitol Hill newsmen have claimed that CARL, before his marriage, was president of the Congressional Bachelor's Club. He denies that any such organization ever existed. "They just made that up," he asserts.

Like many bachelors, CARL had been waiting for the right woman. When he met Mary, the search ended. He quickly succumbed to her charm, intelligence and captivating wit. Mrs. Vinson's photographs, on prominent display in all three of Uncle CARL's residences, attest to her beauty.

Just as some Milledgeville citizens think CARL "hung the moon," others agree the task was made easier for him with Mary at his side. Their romance lasted until her death, almost 30 years after their marriage.

During his first term on Capitol Hill, CARL drew two committee assignments, neither of which particularly inspired him. One was on the old Pension Committee, now defunct, and the other was on the Committee for the District of Columbia. He worked industriously on both, but kept his eyes open for something better.

In 1917, the opportunity presented itself. Vacancies opened up on a few choice committees. He picked Naval Affairs. Why, has always been a mystery to those who look at his landlocked district. The only body of water near Milledgeville at the time (the city now has manmade Lake Sinclair) was the Oconee River, a sluggish red-brown stream about a third as wide as Washington's Potomac.

There was no mystery on CARL's part. He was concerned about the Nation's defenses. He already had started urging increased spending for national security, declaring that peace can be guaranteed only if a nation is prepared to defend itself. He believed the new committee assignment would provide a needed arena in which to fight for his views.

He also foresaw a growing role for seapower. Europe was embroiled in World War I and CARL accurately predicted in 1916 that participants in the conflict would emerge "with larger navies than at the beginning." This, too, influenced his choice.

Aside from the practical reasons for seeking a seat on Naval Affairs, CARL also had a personal motive: "I wanted to serve on a committee where I could see the results of my labors. When you authorize the construction of a military base or a big carrier you can see the results."

His choice proved fortunate. During the next 7 years, eight Democratic members of the committee were defeated, died, or resigned. By 1923, VINSON was the ranking Democrat.

The same time period brought two rugged contests for his House seat. One opponent, Tom Watson (later a U.S. Senator), was the man whose collar Vinson had refused to wear. The other was Sam Olive, president of the Georgia Senate. Both were strong men in Georgia politics. Both lost their fights with VINSON.

In 1931, Georgia again redistricted and Baldwin County was restored to the Sixth District where VINSON found himself pitted against two incumbent Congressmen. He talked one into retiring. The other, whom

he was preparing to face in the primaries, died before the campaign got underway. A third opponent, Judge R. Earl Camp, stepped into the breach. In an open letter, he promised VINSON, "I am going to give you hell, and when I say hell, I mean nothing but merry hell, and I don't mean maybe. I am going to take the flesh, bone, marrow, hide and hair off of you."

The threat was more colorful than accurate. Years later when VINSON was officially nominated for his 18th consecutive term, Judge Camp seconded the nomination with the comment, "I'm glad he defeated me."

Other opposition has been sporadic and equally unsuccessful. In some campaigns, VINSON has not even bothered to make speeches. His last opponent (Carter Shepard Baldwin, in 1956) lost by a lopsided vote of almost 4 to 1.

During his 46 years in Congress, VINSON has played a predominant role in the growth of American military power.

One of his earliest contributions to national security came in 1925 when President Calvin Coolidge appointed a nine-member group (the Morrow Board) to make a sweeping inquiry into the state of the Nation's air defense. Three of those appointed by the President were Members of Congress. VINSON was the lone Democrat.

The probe—touched off by Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell's sensational charges against the administration of the air arms of both the Army and Navy—was set up to look into "the best means of developing and applying aircraft in national defense." In addition to Mitchell, some of the other witnesses were Orville Wright, Herbert Hoover (then Secretary of Commerce), Maj. H. H. Arnold (later head of the Air Force) and Lt. F. P. Sherman (later Chief of Naval Operations).

The Board, after extensive hearings, recommended numerous changes in laws affecting aviation. VINSON authored many of the proposals. All were enacted. Assistant secretaries for aeronautics were established in the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments. Five-year aircraft procurement programs were approved for the services. The Army Air Corps was created. The principle of flight pay was permanently sanctioned. New emphasis was given to the procurement of aviators and improved aircraft. The Air Commerce Act—legislative cornerstone for the development of U.S. civil and commercial aviation—was adopted.

VINSON has been cited by the National Aeronautic Association as an "Elder Statesman of Aviation" for his role in this and subsequent developments in the field of aviation.

Before America's entry into World War II, as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, he fought for a big build-up of the Navy's air arm. Later, both as ranking Democrat and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he battled for the Air Force.

How he backstaged the post-World War II increase in naval aviation is recorded in an official Pentagon paper.

Twenty months before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, VINSON called Adm. Harold Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, to his office. The late Forrest P. Sherman (then a captain) accompanied the CNO to take notes. Here is part of what Sherman recorded about the conference:

"Mr. VINSON desires to have a program prepared for the further expansion of naval aviation. * * * The program as he describes it, involves 10,000 to 15,000 pilots. * * * Mr. VINSON indicated positively his opinion that an additional training establishment should be established now, that adequate bases should be built now for coastal patrol and protection of vital coastal traffic, and that our construction and training programs should be greatly expanded. * * * Admiral Stark asked if this program were for the next

session of Congress. Mr. VINSON indicated that he would initiate action at this session."

Shortly thereafter, Uncle CARL sent two bills to the floor. One to expand naval aviation to 10,000 planes, train 16,000 pilots and establish 20 air bases; the other to speed naval construction and ease labor restrictions in the shipbuilding industry. Passage of both bills was "preceded by a mere whisper of debate," one newspaper related.

In 1948, VINSON engineered an increase in appropriations to boost the Air Force to 70 groups. He told the House, "We must recognize that Russia has not traditionally been a naval power. * * * In the air we are capable of competing with the Russians and they are capable of competing with us. * * * As I have studied the military situation of this country I am driven again and again to the conclusion * * * that we will be gambling with our national existence if we do not provide the funds for a great Air Force." The House approved the increase by a vote of 343-3; the Senate by a vote of 74-2.

When he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the following year, he immediately introduced legislation to give added teeth to the Armed Services Unification Act. Among other things, his plan set up authority for guided missile work. He said, "The Air Force is not now directed by law to concentrate on the development of guided missiles which in time may become exceedingly important to our national defense. My bill deals expressly with this important matter by enjoining the Air Force to work actively in the development of these weapons."

In April 1950, shortly before the Korean war, he took to the House floor to blast the administration's failure to build the 70-group Air Force. He attacked defense reductions asked by President Truman and his Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. He charged that Johnson, in slashing at service "fat," had cut into the "sinew and muscle" of the fighting forces. Johnson subsequently resigned.

With the eruption of the Korean conflict, Truman had to seek \$10 billion in emergency funds. VINSON proposed a number of bills to restore the Armed Forces to fighting trim. In the floor debate, Republicans and Democrats attacked each other for inadequate preparedness. Uncle CARL ended the argument and won a standing ovation when he declared: "Our great need right now is to get the ox out of the ditch—not to spend a lot of time and effort trying to find out who pushed him in."

VINSON's role in the growth of U.S. seapower is spectacular. Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz has said, "I do not know where this country would have been after December 7, 1941, if it had not had the ships and the know-how to build more ships fast, for which one Vinson bill after another was responsible."

Although the First World War had brought a temporary build-up of the fleet, many warships were sunk under the postwar treaty agreements, and the Navy was forced to limp along on skimpy rations for a long period of time. Only a fortuitous combination of circumstances saved it.

When he became chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1931, VINSON immediately set out to restore the fleet to what he believed was its rightful place on the seas. "I favor a Navy for our country second to none," he declared. To enforce his views, he quickly introduced a ship construction program to bring the fleet up to treaty strength. The appeal was doomed. Needed White House support failed to materialize. "Not one ship was authorized during the Hoover administration," he recalls.

In the strange ways of history, however, VINSON soon found a powerful ally—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Their friendship and

mutual respect had been solidly cemented when F.D.R. was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In the famous "first 100 days" of the Roosevelt administration, the National Industrial Recovery Act was signed into law. VINSON convinced the President that if industry was to be revitalized, the Navy might as well be one of the benefactors. The act gave the President authority to allot money for the construction of naval vessels within the terms and limits of the London Naval Treaty.

The following year (1934), Uncle CARL won approval for two more bills to further expand the shipbuilding program. One was the historic Vinson-Trammell Act which provided long-range ship tonnage authority for the Navy. The immediate goal was 102 new ships by 1942. The act also limited the profits of contractors and expanded the naval aviation program.

Additional shipbuilding programs sponsored by VINSON and backed by F.D.R. were approved in 1938, 1939, and 1940. Three days after the last of the measures had cleared Congress (and 4 days after the fall of Paris), Uncle CARL went to the White House to win Presidential backing for still more tonnage.

This time, F.D.R. suggested he wait. VINSON disregarded the advice, returned to Capitol Hill, introduced the bill and set hearings for the following day. "F.D.R. called me on the 'phone the next morning," he recalls, "and asked me why I had gone ahead when he had told me it was not a good idea. I told him 'I disagree with you, Mr. President. There is not time to wait.'" Five days later, he rushed the measure through the House on a voice vote. It provided for 1,250,000 tons of new ships—birth of the two-ocean Navy.

The late Senator David Walsh, VINSON's counterpart in the Senate at the time, later said he wanted "the Record" to clearly show that the movement for the two-ocean Navy began in Congress, was approved by Congress and was "largely due to the foresight, ability and judgment of the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee."

VINSON's battles for the Navy during his 15-year tenure as Naval Affairs chairman earned him a reputation as a Navy partisan. Some of his colleagues still call him the admiral.

Neither then, nor since, however, has he blindly done the bidding of the admirals. When some of the Navy's battleship officers doggedly held on to the giant vessels after World War II, he finally told them to get a beautiful picture of one of the warships, "bring it up and we will hang it on the wall—the day of the battleship is over."

When the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs were merged into the Armed Services Committee in 1947, he made it clear that he would devote his future efforts not only to the problems of the Navy and Marine Corps, but those of the Army and Air Force, as well.

In 1949, when the Navy and Air Force tangled in an ugly dispute over the respective merits of the B-36 bomber and the aircraft carrier—in what came to be known as the admiral's revolt—VINSON ordered and presided over a full-scale investigation of the controversy. He eventually broadened the hearings into a sweeping study of service unification and strategy which culminated in a 56-page report. More than any other, that document, written in large part by Committee Counsel Bryce Harlow (later a top Eisenhower aid at the White House), set the stage for the present defense organization.

Many of its recommendations and conclusions still make sense today. The report states that "Prudent administration of unification, sensitive to the many imponderables of spirit and emotion and service loyalties, can greatly ease service tensions and difficulties over the years that must pass before cross education of the services will truly produce the one-armed-force concept. Hasty

decisions and brusque dismissals of honestly held service views will aggravate these tensions and difficulties. Cross education of the services holds the ultimate key to the perplexing problems of interservice relations. A much greater concentration of effort is needed in this field.

VINSON made it clear in the report that Congress will never tolerate being shunted to the sidelines or barred from the fulfillment of its constitutional role to raise and equip armies.

The report states that civilian control of the Armed Forces is an integral part of the democratic process and tradition, but this "does not mean (1) preventing free testimony before congressional committees by members of the Armed Forces, or (2) the relegation of the U.S. Congress to a bystander role in issues pertaining to the national defense."

Over the past 14 years, some of the most important legislation ever enacted for the Armed Forces has been shaped by VINSON's committee. Included in the vast array of laws are measures which have preserved the Marine Corps, established a separate Air Force with its own Academy, provided for continued growth of the Navy, set standard procurement practices and consolidated military purchasing. The Pentagon has been organized and reorganized. Field commands have been unified. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been given broader authorities. Service housing, pay, promotion, medical care, and survivor benefits have been enormously improved to assure a career military force.

For the past several years, Uncle CARL has been waging a vigorous fight for the Army. He wants more modern weapons and equipment for the ground forces. He has even taken the unusual step (for him) of personally appealing to the Appropriations Committee to give the Army additional modernization funds. The funds (millions of dollars above what President Eisenhower requested) have been approved by both the House and Senate, but not all of the money was released by the previous administration. Unless the trend is reversed by President Kennedy, the battle is likely to pick up speed.

Uncle CARL also is getting worried about the Navy's aging ships and the growing Russian missile capability. He is impatiently waiting to learn what President Kennedy has in mind for the Armed Forces. Whatever the plan—if it is to win VINSON's approval—it will have to meet certain rigid tests which have evolved out of his basic philosophies concerning military preparedness:

The Nation must be adequately armed to prevent aggression or, if it comes, to defeat it on either a big or little battlefield. "The most expensive thing in the world is a cheap army and navy. History has clearly shown that weakness invites attack."

The size of the fighting forces must be geared to the strategic plans laid down by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and not to political considerations or arbitrary dollar limitations. "Our national defense problems must always be resolved with complete freedom from partisan bias or favor. If it is a question of choosing between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Budget Bureau, I will place my confidence in the Joint Chiefs."

Existing weapons must not be scrapped in favor of plans still on the drawing boards. "Blueprints may be cheap, but they cannot defend the rights of the Nation."

The specialized functions of the individual services must not be impaired or destroyed. "War is three dimensional (land, sea, and air) and the four services exist for the simple reason that there are four separate and distinct missions which are assigned to them."

Merger of the services would spell disaster. "It would not save the taxpayer one thin dime, and would provide a one-way ticket

to defeat. Competition is the heart and soul of American industry and the American people, why should it be denied to the Armed Forces?"

President Kennedy, who served in the House from 1947-52, has seen Uncle CARL's operations up close. He knows what has happened to those in both parties who have attempted to buck the Vinson formula for sound national security. If the Chief Executive's new plans for the Armed Forces fail to win Uncle CARL's backing, the country may witness the battle of the century.

VINSON, as he approaches the 50-year mark in his long congressional service, shows no sign that he is willing to compromise his basic beliefs as they relate to the Nation's security, or that he has lost any of the legislative skill which has enabled him to bring them to full fruition.

Although he has sometimes talked about retiring, his colleagues in the Congress doubt that such an event ever will take place.

When Uncle CARL last mentioned the subject to Speaker RAYBURN, "Mr. SAM" told him, "Now, CARL, you're not going to do any such thing. We're both going to stay right here until we die."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H.R. 845, H.R. 856, H.R. 858, H.R. 860, H.R. 861, H.R. 866, H.R. 2953, and H.R. 3587.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ENCOURAGING FOREIGN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill that would permit the Department of Commerce to expand its program for encouraging foreign travel to the United States.

Tourism is one way to decrease our international payments deficit. In 1959 American tourists spent nearly \$2 billion abroad, while foreign tourists spent about \$970 million in the United States, leaving a deficit of about \$1 billion.

Studies made by our committee show that the United States is doing little or nothing to encourage citizens of other countries to travel in the United States, whereas other countries are carrying on elaborate and well-financed programs to encourage Americans to tour abroad.

Approximately 70 percent of the tourist spending in the United States is by visitors from our immediate neighbors, Canada and Mexico. If we exclude spending by visitors from these two countries, expenditures of foreign visitors in the United States are less than a third of what American travelers spend overseas. Furthermore, a great majority of these foreign visitors in the United States are actually not tourists, but

businessmen, government officials, and exchange students.

At least 22 nations currently maintain tourist offices in the United States. It is estimated that at least \$20 million is spent annually by foreign nations to attract U.S. visitors. Probably the most effective of these activities are the large-scale radio, newspaper, and magazine advertising campaigns carried on by foreign tourist agencies and carriers.

The United States needs to give more attention to furnishing foreign nationals information regarding tourist attractions in the United States.

To do this the bill sets up an Office of International Travel and Tourism in the Department of Commerce. It is the duty of this office to encourage travel by foreign residents to the United States so as to provide a more friendly understanding of our peoples and our institutions, and to stimulate facilities and arrangements within the United States for taking care of the requirements of these foreign visitors.

One of the important objectives would be to dispel the idea held by many foreigners regarding the cost of visiting this country. The agency would cooperate with other Government agencies and private industry.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following feature editorial appeared in the Los Angeles Times for Friday morning, January 20, 1961:

CRITICISM AND THE COMMITTEE

The Congress is again being deluged by demands that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished, that a halt be called to this controversial legislative inquiry into the shape and extent of the Communist threat.

It has been suggested by the committee's defenders that all of its critics are subversives or dupes. They are not. There has been responsible and justified criticism of both the personnel and procedures of the committee.

The issue, however, is not whether the performance of the committee has been ideal, but whether its imperfections justify its elimination. We think not.

No thoughtful person would seriously state that the danger of Soviet subversion has ended, or even lessened. It is a constant aim and continuous effort of the Communists to try to undermine this Nation by any means possible.

If the threat then persists, it is surely the obligation of the Congress to concern itself with the problem, and to seek information and remedies.

Many opponents of the Committee on Un-American Activities would say that the combating of subversion should be left entirely to the FBI and Central Intelligence Agency, and similar bodies. Does this mean that they want their elected representatives to abandon any direct interest in the matter?

We would not argue that the committee has fulfilled its difficult task perfectly—any more than we would claim this for any other

congressional group. HCUA members have demonstrated overzealousness and an over-concern for the publicity value of their hearings and findings. Yet, this is hardly something unique in a committee of the Congress.

Nor should this committee, in the final analysis, be judged solely according to some arbitrary formula that states that X number of hearings should produce Y number of proposed bills. The function of legislative inquiry is too vital to be circumscribed by such specious criteria.

To concede the committee's faults is not to condone them. They should be corrected, but not by abolishing the committee. The potential usefulness of the Committee on Un-American Activities outweighs, we feel, any responsible argument for its elimination.

FROM AN ADDRESS BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN AT WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CEREMONY, INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, 100 YEARS AGO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago tomorrow, Abraham Lincoln, in a Washington memorial ceremony raised a flag at Independence Hall in Philadelphia and, in the course of his brief and extemporaneous remarks on that occasion, uttered words which exemplify the high ideals of our country and which, if possible, would have more meaning and wider application, but no less validity, than when he spoke them. He said:

All the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated and were given to the world from this hall in which we stand. . . . I have often pondered over the dangers incurred by the men who assembled here and adopted that Declaration of Independence. . . . I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together, it was not the mere matter of separation of the Colonies from the mother land; but something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance.

Thus were the sentiments of three of our greatest Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln joined in one ceremonial expression. And today, with our strivings to create a better life for all our citizens and for oppressed peoples throughout the world, we could not do better than to adopt them as our own.

The principles which Lincoln described are above section, above race, above creed, and above party.

Expressed in the stirring language which he could command as no other American could, Lincoln's peroration should move us today to the great exertions which our national future and the fate of the world require.

CVII—158

One hundred years ago he stated our goals better than we could state them today. At this anniversary of the birth of the Father of our country, let us determine to make these goals into realities.

THE LATE DR. TOM DOOLEY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill requesting the striking of a gold medal with proper wording thereon to be given posthumously to Dr. Tom Dooley. When the medal called for in the bill is struck, it will be presented to his mother, Mrs. Agnes Dooley.

I trust when the bill comes to the floor, it will be considered promptly and will be passed unanimously.

UTILIZING THE FACILITIES OF PRIVATE COMMERCIAL SHIP REPAIR YARDS

Mr. SEELEY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELEY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to require the expenditure of at least 75 percent of the funds expended for naval alteration, conversion or repair of vessels with private commercial ship repair yards.

This bill is a companion to one introduced in the Senate on January 31 by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland. Both bills have the same objective.

The objective, Mr. Speaker, is the strengthening of our economy by utilizing the facilities of private enterprise to the greatest degree possible, and in so doing, to provide employment for a maximum number of workers of all degrees of skill, to provide earnings for the private owners of shipyards on their capital, for which they expect to and will pay the Government substantial amounts in taxes.

Although the present administration has professed to be as strongly in favor of the elimination or minimizing of Government competition with private industry as the administration that preceded it, the fact is that the tendency of the Navy to concentrate in its shipyards all of the conversion, alteration and repair work, has increased year by year for a considerable period. The point has been reached today, where 80 percent of all such work is now being done in the Navy's own shipyards.

The result of this policy is that employment in private shipyards is so low that there is grave danger of the dissolution and removal or abandonment of the very facilities of the private shipbuilding industry upon which our coun-

try, and our allies depend so heavily in time of need.

There is an additional reason, it seems to me, for acting favorably upon this bill with promptness, and that is the contribution which the provisions of this bill will make to immediate stimulating of employment and to combating the recession in business.

Under the provisions of this bill, 75 percent of the Navy's repair and alteration work would be done, on a competitive basis, in privately owned shipyards. The Government will get more for its money, and will help to relieve both temporary and chronic unemployment.

The objectives of this bill are of economic as well as patriotic interest in my State, and in my district. In the Senate, my colleague from Connecticut, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, has joined Senator BUTLER in cosponsoring the bill which has been introduced there.

I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to give early consideration to the bill which I have introduced or to its companion, so that the worthy objectives may be promptly achieved.

FEDERALIZED EDUCATION

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the White House education message we received yesterday is self-contradictory. It says:

Education must remain a matter of State and local control.

In the next paragraph it says:

Our twin goals must be: a new standard of excellence—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

Obviously the new standard of excellence will be the Federal, not the existing State and school district standard.

Federal funds may be exacted from our citizens only for a Federal purpose.

When dispensed to States and local governments, Federal funds are inevitably and properly stamped with the criteria and standards necessary to accomplish the Federal purpose. In these standards and criteria reside Federal control which in turn must necessarily supplant the control of the State and local recipients of Federal aid money. Thereby States and school districts lose their autonomy and independence in deciding what kind of education our children should be given.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

My DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954,

the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Hon. NOAH M. MASON, Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCONSISTENCY OF EFFORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN CONNECTION WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the administration is making a vigorous drive to lessen and, if possible, to end what it calls a depression. Others refer to it as a recession.

We all go along with the objective, but sometimes we wonder if the efforts are consistent, if the administration is getting its efforts coordinated.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Yesterday, an order came down from an administrative department cutting off from their present employment several thousand Federal employees, the only known reason being that those employees were Republicans.

I do not know whether that issue of how to lessen unemployment ought to come up under the civil rights bill and we should then add a provision providing against discrimination because an employee is a Republican, or whether we should bring it up when these various proposals come before us. When this administration throws all these people, to whom reference has just been made, out of a job and they do not get on the unemployment list, you can see that the 17 million, to whom the President referred during the campaign as going to bed hungry, will have an additional number of unemployed added to their ranks. One suggested action defeats another proposal.

What is gained by an increase in the minimum wage, extending the coverage, and then cutting off all the Federal employees who happen to be Republicans—cut their salaries in two? So they will quit—quit because they cannot exist on what is left. It simply will not work out.

Permit a repetition. The administration fights for and insists upon an increase in the minimum wage, an extension in coverage, bringing in, under the law, several million more workers.

The administration insists upon an extended coverage and perhaps some increase in unemployment compensation.

The administration insists that several other legislative programs be adopted, all giving to members of one group or another additional Federal money, all of which, as in the programs just mentioned, must come from taxpayers who have or expect to have an income earned by their own efforts.

The necessity for legislation which will, to at least some extent, lessen unemployment which grows out of strikes and, in particular, strikes in public utilities where the income of the employer is limited by a governmental agency, has long been evident, and bills to assist in the solution of the problem have time and again been introduced by me. However, the committee having jurisdiction—the Committee on Education and Labor—has neglected and refused to give consideration to any of those bills. Yesterday, another bill, H.R. 4587, was dropped in the hopper, but if it meets the fate of previous ones, it, too, will be ignored.

The need for that type of legislation is shown by the pending strike in the aircraft industry. An editorial bearing upon that situation comes from this morning's Chicago Tribune, and reads:

STRIKES IN CONTEMPT OF EVERYBODY

It is hard to think of a strike meriting less popular support than that of the flight engineers' union, which has crippled six major airlines. The walkout is in violation of Federal court orders in three cities. It defies a Presidential order creating a fact-finding board, which legally requires postponement of a strike for 60 days.

The strikers also rejected an appeal by Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg that they go back to work while he makes an investigation.

The basic issue in the dispute is whether flight engineers qualified as pilots should be represented by the engineers' union or the larger Air Line Pilots Association. Recently the National Mediation Board directed pilots and engineers employed by United Air Lines to form a single bargaining unit. The engineers fear their union will be swallowed up by the pilots' group.

The dispute is reminiscent of several recent strikes in the railroad industry. Last fall a jurisdictional dispute involving maintenance workers shut down the entire Pennsylvania Railroad system, causing revenue losses estimated at \$40 million. Early this year several eastern railroads were tied up and thousands of New York commuters inconvenienced by a strike of a few tugboat men.

Credit for ending the tugboat walkout was given to Secretary Goldberg, although in fact the dispute was not settled; it was referred to the Commission named by former President Eisenhower to study featherbedding in the railroad industry. Goldberg's intervention in what should have been a minor dispute had the bad effect of inviting all unions to look to the White House, instead of using the normal machinery for settling disagreements.

Time and again a handful of workers has knocked out a large part of the Nation's transportation industry by calling a strike in violation of Government mediation boards. The flight engineers have compounded their injury to the public by defying the national courts of law.

The officers of the union seek to evade responsibility by saying that the walkout

was unauthorized. From time to time other unions have used the same excuse to avoid contempt of court proceedings. A strike is rarely spontaneous; it is nearly always the result of a well-organized plan or conspiracy. An organization and its individual members engaging in such a conspiracy in violation of court orders ought to be punishable, and it is time that some judge took appropriate action.

Until an overwhelming majority of the voters who are adversely affected by these reprehensible strikes grow angry enough to force the Congress to act, no action will be taken.

During the war when the railroad employees went on strike and tied up transportation, an angry House overnight passed a draft bill.

The Taft-Hartley bill was forced through this House by an outraged public when and only when the voters made it clear that, unless legislation of that type was enacted many of the Members would not be reelected.

The legislation was passed over President Truman's veto.

A similar situation forced the House to accept the Landrum-Griffin bill even though many of the House Members, according to the report on file with the Clerk of the House, had received campaign contributions from the UAW-CIO which bitterly fought the acceptance of the bill.

Why is it that we cannot, without being prodded, adopt legislation which we know is in the interests of the people as a whole, which will promote the general welfare.

APPOINTMENT OF EARL E. T. SMITH AS U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SWITZERLAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of the appointment of the Honorable Earl E. T. Smith as U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland was very pleasing to me. This sense of pleasure resulted from my strong feeling that Mr. Smith would do an outstanding job for our country as its envoy to one of the countries with which we have enjoyed the warmest relations throughout our history.

Since that time I have been distressed to read in some of our newspapers that the President's designation of Mr. Smith was being opposed in certain quarters. I am sure that some of this opposition is conscientious, but I am certain that this type of objection is based upon misinformation and lack of knowledge of the true merits of this great American.

Mr. Smith has a record of accomplishment in business life which indicates without question that he is a man of tremendous ability. Those of us who have been privileged to know him personally are certain that he possesses the

traits of character and personality which eminently qualify him for an ambassadorial post.

I first met this gentleman during his service as our Ambassador to the Republic of Cuba. It was during a visit to that country which Mrs. Whitener and I and some of our friends made in September before the Castro coup in early 1959. During that visit to Cuba I had the privilege of conferring with Ambassador Smith on several occasions in private about our situation in Cuba. These conferences were held at the request of Mr. Smith and were on a confidential basis. The desire of Mr. Smith that our conferences be treated confidentially has been scrupulously honored by me since that time.

It is my present feeling that in view of some of the erroneous criticism that I have read of Mr. Smith's services in Cuba that I should try to set the record straight insofar as the accusation of his alleged pro-Batista leanings are concerned. Nothing that he said to me during my contact with him indicated that there were any such leanings on his part. On the contrary, I have the firm conviction that Ambassador Smith was taking a realistic view of the situation then prevailing in Cuba in that he felt that a change in the Cuban Government for the sake merely of making a change was not necessarily desirable. He knew better than any person with whom I have come into contact what could be expected if the Castro revolution prevailed. It was in the light of this knowledge that Ambassador Smith operated in a way which, in my judgment, was to the best interests of the United States and the people of Cuba.

It has been the source of considerable amazement to me to note how accurately Ambassador Smith predicted the course of Cuba's future under Castro as we talked privately in Havana, Cuba, in late 1958. He had a much greater understanding of the then present and the now accomplished future of Cuba than any man in my acquaintanceship.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the life, character, and services of Earl E. T. Smith do not necessitate any defense by me or any other person. His record as a great American is available to all who desire to appraise it. In my considered opinion an honest appraisal of that record will lead any reasonable person to the inescapable conclusion that Mr. Smith would make an outstanding Ambassador to Switzerland or to any other country to which he might be named by the President of the United States.

I express the hope that the rumblings that have appeared on the surface in recent days will soon pass away and that the appointment of Mr. Smith as Ambassador to Switzerland will become an accomplished fact. When this is done, I predict that the people of this Nation, as well as the great people of Switzerland, will have a sense of deep appreciation for the wisdom of our President in naming him and the willingness of Mr. Smith to assume this important role in our foreign affairs.

RECENT SURVEY DOUBTFUL DISTRESSED AREAS CAN ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRY

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's Department of Commerce secured new industry for Pennsylvania but here is an angle we have to consider too. We cannot just put up money and hope to grab industries away because all localities are seeking new industries, whether it be New York, New England, and even down South. The following article from the Juniata Sentinel, that is published in my district, is most interesting in this respect:

[From the Juniata Sentinel, Jan. 11, 1961]
RECENT SURVEY DOUBTFUL DISTRESSED AREAS CAN ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The State of Pennsylvania, Altoona Enterprises, and many other community industrial development groups have worked hard in recent years to secure new industry in depressed areas. Much has been said for and against the goals of these groups. An article on the subject appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 25. The article, written by A. H. Rasikin, states that a survey of New York and New England has raised doubts that distressed areas can fully regain loss of jobs. The article is reprinted here.)

Doubt that distressed areas can be restored to economic health by efforts to attract new industry has been expressed in a special State study.

The survey of local and regional development corporations in areas of high unemployment in New York and New England concludes that community campaigns to bring in new business have generally failed to offset the job losses caused by the decline of old industries.

The study is certain to stir debate because it runs counter to the philosophy of the redevelopment program being drafted by President-elect John F. Kennedy's advisory committee on depressed areas. A key element in the Kennedy program is the supplying of Federal funds to help localities finance construction of new plants and facilities as a means of attracting new enterprises.

The analysis was prepared by a faculty team at the business research center of Syracuse University for the temporary State commission on economic expansion, headed by Devereux C. Josephs. It may be part of the basic data for the final report the commission submitted to Governor Rockefeller and the legislature last Wednesday.

In its own conclusions the commission expressed reserve about how much good the projected Federal program would do. It warned that large-scale aid to areas with chronic labor surplus might injure the total State economy.

"This belief is based on the fear that more or much of the industry and jobs which will be channeled into economically stranded or underdeveloped areas will inevitably be drawn from other industrial States, including New York," the Josephs group said.

Even apart from this reservation, the commission reacted coldly to the probability of Federal action. It said it was not altogether convinced that Government assistance, unless of a more drastic type than anything now

contemplated, will prove to be the magic by which a local area will take its forward leap.

"A primary responsibility for finding adaptation to excess unemployment or low income will, in our view, always rest with the community," the report declared. "For in the final analysis, the rate at which the needy areas of New York or other States recover or grow will depend on their ability to supply private industry with a profitable location."

The commission's two labor members, Jacob S. Potofsky and Harold C. Hanover, who dissented from the report's key recommendations on how to speed economic expansion, did not file a specific dissent on this section; however, Mr. Potofsky emphasized that the unionists were in total disagreement with the implied criticism of the Kennedy program.

The Syracuse University study avoided any direct comment on the possible impact of Federal activity. However, it was blunt in evaluating the attempts already undertaken by most distressed areas to induce new employers to move in. It said:

"There is no evidence that community or regional development corporations and activities have been successful in New York or New England. This is a flat statement, but one which we think is justified."

The report noted Amsterdam, N.Y., as a city that had made heroic efforts to heal the wounds inflicted on its economy by the departure of its carpet industry without any substantial measure of success.

Burlington, Vt., was cited as the sole clear exception to a declaration that the number of jobs brought in by induced industry rarely equaled the number lost by migration. Even this observation was qualified by a note that Burlington had started from a relatively high base in its march toward economic recovery.

The university study did not dispute the desirability of attempts by communities with chronic idleness to seek new industry but it warned that such moves were not likely to restore their old economic position and insure growth.

It suggested as an alternative the use of public funds to assist in training people for work in more prosperous communities. The report said the facts supported the wisdom of assisting people to move rather than putting all the eggs of public policy in the basket of attracting industry.

Another device recommended in the study was a conscious policy of giving industrially weak communities preference in the location of colleges, hospitals, and other large public or private institutions. Where the cost disadvantages of such a policy are not too great, it can help expand job opportunities and prevent migration of young workers, the report declared.

The general economic health of the State was pronounced good. The study urged that continued stress be put on making the business climate as attractive as possible and on advertising the State's advantages in markets, money, and manpower.

Both the State and its areas of high unemployment will do best, the report said, if economic developments are not distorted by attempts to influence industrial location in an uneconomic fashion.

The authors of the study were Sidney C. Sufrin, John H. Thompson, Marion A. Buck, and Arland E. Charlton, all attached to the staff of the business research center.

THE "SANTA MARIA" AFFAIR AND OUR AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE PLANNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent *Santa Maria* affair further highlights the fact that we should only consider our own American-flag ships in our national defense planning.

There is at present a large number of American-owned ships registered under the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras that are referred to as escape-flag ships. They are referred to as escape-flag ships because some years ago a group of Wall Street lawyers created this transfer foreign gimmick so that the American international oil companies could avoid and eventually destroy the existing wage and working standards of American seamen and, at the same time, avoid U.S. taxes.

Because of a shirking of responsibility, coupled with the desire of some people in the past administration to show favor to certain major oil and steel trusts, our American-flag merchant marine is deficient in capability to meet national wartime requirements for merchant-type ocean shipping.

We are told that we should not be alarmed by this deficiency because there is a sufficient number of these escape-flag ships that could be counted upon in time of a national emergency because they are under effective control. A ship is considered by the Department of Defense to be under effective control when the following situations exist: Contractual or voluntary agreements between the owners of the ships and the government making the ships available to the U.S. Government in the event of a national emergency; when the countries in which these ships are registered do not at present impose restrictions on the operational control of the ships registered under their flag; and, when these countries in which the ships are registered have limited requirements.

The contractual arrangements are worth less than the paper they are written on, because the owners that have signed the voluntary agreements could transfer their ships to some other country that would not relinquish control or the countries in which these ships are registered could change their laws, thereby preventing them from coming under U.S. control.

The contractual arrangements mean even less when we realize the basic fact that the seamen that man these escape-flag ships are the ones, and the only ones, that really have control.

As to whether or not we could rely upon these ships hinges upon whether or not these seamen, who do not owe allegiance to the United States, but instead to some other country, whose ideological and political philosophies are frequently and most usually different from ours, would turn the ships over to us.

This basic fact is ignored by these advocates of the effective-control theory who have continually maintained that the basic underlying reason that these

ships are under effective control is that our Navy could and would seize these ships, regardless of the desires of the crew, when they were directed to do so. The recent incident involving the Portuguese liner, the *Santa Maria*, demonstrates how impossible it would be to corral several hundred ships that are trying to avoid seizure.

The fact that the *Santa Maria* could avoid detection by the U.S. Navy while in our own hemisphere, further highlights the fakery and idiotic logic behind the effective-control concept.

HE DOESN'T LIKE "JACK"

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, brief but to the point, is from the Lebanon Daily News and if it portends the Federal spending spree indicated by current Federal action, we are going to need a lot of "jack" which is the expression for greenbacks:

HE DOESN'T LIKE "JACK"

Newspapers in 1932 found the word "Roosevelt" nigh on to impossible to fit into small headlines. The substitute, of course, was F.D.R.

That familiarity granted public acceptance, it was perfectly natural that when Harry Truman ascended to the Presidency, newspapers should adopt his initials for identification purposes, even though "Truman" was a far less unwieldy word than "Roosevelt."

Eisenhower was long and difficult to fit into flexible type and Ike proved ideal.

Now it is logical that instead of Kennedy, J.F.K. should be permitted as a tool for headline writers. This does not especially please the President-elect, however. He told the Associated Press he preferred Kennedy, although he would not object to J.F.K. But he made it very clear that he would be opposed to use of Jack in the headlines.

If one reflects upon the connotation of Jack as it applies to that commodity with which Mr. Kennedy is so richly endowed, his attitude is understandable.

SIXTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 15 was the 63d anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, the tragedy that triggered the war with Spain. It is an anniversary always observed by the veterans of that war and never has it gone unnoticed. In every city and every hamlet in America, while still there are camps of the United Spanish War Veterans, it will continue to be observed with services of loving tribute to the memory of the 260 American sailors who perished with the *Maine* and by the sacrifice of their lives started our country on its road to world destiny.

Ninety-three veterans of that war of long ago served in this historic Chamber. The gentleman from Illinois alone remains. With him it is a solemn obligation in comradeship with those with whom he served in youth, most of whom are gone, to keep aflame in a modern world the spirit of 1898.

In the early weeks of the war, training at Camp Alger near Falls Church for later participation in the siege of Santiago in Cuba, the gentleman from Illinois was an infantryman in Company I of the 33d Michigan, a company recruited from the youth of Berrien County in the district now represented by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], my warm personal friend. In the same brigade and accompanying the 33d Michigan to Cuba was the 9th Massachusetts, largely recruited from the youth in the district now represented by our beloved majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the organization you speak of the one in which our former distinguished colleagues, Mr. Mapes and Mr. Michener, both of Michigan, served?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Both served in the 33d Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Both Republicans.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. When it comes to patriotism I do not draw any party lines.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nor do I.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And I may say to the gentleman from Michigan the reason I left Michigan as a boy was that I could see no chance for a Democrat. When I was a boy we had one Democrat in the general assembly at Lansing, but since then the people of Michigan have improved in their wisdom.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And suffered in their pocketbooks.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to say on behalf of the citizens of the county of Berrien, of the Fourth District, and those living in the Third and the Fifth Districts, that they are very, very happy to pay tribute to the gentleman for the wonderful ability and service he has given to the citizens of Chicago. The gentleman has served them for many years—ably and with patriotism, and I think they have profited by the transplanted wisdom you carried to them.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am sure that in my district the words of my good friend from Michigan will be warmly received.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The people of Chicago are to be congratulated upon their selection and retention of the gentleman as their representative.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the majority whip.

Mr. ALBERT. It is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on this occasion. I congratulate the gentleman for taking the time for this purpose. The House is honored in having among its membership a distinguished Member who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War.

I believe since the gentleman last discussed this subject in the House, those who served in the Spanish-American War have become the senior veterans of our country. Not long ago with the passing of the last Confederate veteran, the final rollcall of those who served in the Civil War was answered. The Blue and the Gray have faded into history, and now the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is one of the illustrious group who are the deans of all living men who have had the honor of fighting for their country during time of war.

A number of Spanish-American War veterans live in my congressional district. Many years ago, they established a colony in the beautiful mountain country of southeastern Oklahoma. With the depletion of their number, they have opened the community to veterans of all wars. It has been my privilege on many occasions to visit this community and to address its members.

One of the issues between Spain and the United States which precipitated the war was the situation in Cuba, then a Spanish possession. Crushed by oppression, the Cuban people had attempted many unsuccessful revolutions. Their struggle for liberty captured the hearts of their northern neighbors and many American soldiers once more gave their lives that freedom might live.

Today, Cuba once again lies under the dictator's heel. I know I speak for the veterans of the war that brought freedom to Cuba when I extend sympathy to her people and the heartfelt wish that it will not be long before they once again join the ranks of the free nations of the world.

Sixty-three years ago today, 266 officers and men died on the *Maine*. Let us hope that another year will not pass without recognition by Cuba of the place these men earned for her in the family of nations. Let us hope that a year from now we will congratulate, not only our war veterans, but a free and democratic neighbor, as well.

Again let me congratulate my illustrious and beloved colleague for the fine presentation he is making to the House at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I might tell him that whenever the Spanish War Veterans meet in their national encampments the lads from Oklahoma always mention with affection the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority whip of this House.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to pay high compliment to the gentleman from Illinois for bringing to the attention of this House the incident that brought about active hostilities in the Spanish-American War, and I want to

recount to the House his valiant service in that war as a soldier. This was not a great war as we measure the last two wars; there were not millions of people engaged; you did not have pushbutton communications; logistics as we know them were unknown. But the suffering and the sacrifices made by the men who fought the Spanish-American War were as deep as any in any war that has ever been fought in this world. The food was bad, it was rotten. In many cases they had to fight cholera, typhoid, and other epidemics with which they did not know how to cope in that day. So I am happy to join with the gentleman in honoring the valiant men who fought that war. I know some of the difficulties they must have encountered and the sufferings they must have endured, for I served in World War I. I will not presume to speak of World War II but will let my distinguished leader, the Democratic whip, do that. I do, however, compliment the gentleman and want to pay my respects through him to the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, when the House met on February 15 a parliamentary situation unexpectedly developed that resulted in the adjournment of the House within a matter of minutes after its convening and the special order of the gentleman from Illinois, as well as other special orders of that day, could not be called. This explains why on February 21, instead of February 15, we are observing the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*.

Mr. Speaker, as appropriate to this occasion I would now address myself to the subject of hemispheric solidarity. President Kennedy has reasserted what President Monroe said in his day and President Cleveland said years later when European powers were threatening in Venezuela, Nicaragua, and elsewhere by indirection to violate the letter and the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. In the affairs of this hemisphere the United States and her sister American Republics will brook no interference by any European power or by any nation whatsoever outside the American Hemisphere. I am heartened that the generation of the New Frontier of the 1960's is seeing eye to eye with the generation of the New Frontier of Monroe's time and the generation of the New Frontier of 1898.

The deep significance of the war with Spain, triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine* 63 years ago, was that it marked the end of European dominion on American shores. It was the answer to the prayers of countless thousands of Cuban men and women, many of whom had died as martyrs, that their beautiful island should be freed of European coils and under government of, for, and by the people take her place among the sovereign nations of the world. The intervention of the United States on the side of Cuba was a manifestation of hemispheric solidarity. It pinpointed the legitimate interest of one member of the American hemispheric community in the struggles of another member to escape into the sunshine of freedom

from the darkness of foreign exploitation and of designs alien to the American concept of free and independent government, of the dignity of man, and of his brotherhood under God.

It would be strange and unnatural if the gentleman from Illinois did not have an interest in Cuba and an affection for her people second only to his interest in his own country and his affection for his own countrymen. One in his age does not discard as an outmoded garment that which was woven from the warm sentiments and deep emotions of his youth. As a boy just turned 16 the cry of "Cuba libre" was as sweet and sacred in my ears as in the ears of my comrades of Cuban blood and in the Cuban uniform with whom I served in the hills around Santiago more than six decades ago.

In those hills died the boys from Michigan, from Massachusetts, from Illinois and other States and the boys from Cuba, died as comrades in a common cause, that Cuba might be free from European dominion, free from any rule save that of her own people.

Mr. Speaker, I have abiding faith that always there will be an enduring bond of friendship between the people of my own United States and the people of the land of my second affection. It could not be otherwise. So many men and women of Cuban birth and blood have contributed so much to our country that the bonds that united us in 1898 have been tightened with each passing generation. Forgetting for the moment those in the field of politics, of the arts, and the professions, and turning to the field of sports, where all meet on the line of merit, with the sole measure that of manly sportsmanship, I might mention that the baseball players and boxers of Cuba have received acclaim from American sporting crowds second to that given to the athletes of no other nation.

Hemispheric solidarity is the shield of all the American Republics against the designs of those outside our hemisphere and whose interest in our hemispheric community is akin to that of a stranger in a neighbor's home.

Hemispheric solidarity is the shield of greatest protection to the smallest of the American Republics.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to speak with frankness both to the people of my own United States and to the people of Cuba, with whom I am bound in the deep affection springing from the associations of my youth.

The fact is that in the new frontier of 1898 there was the same idealism that I envision in the new frontier of the 1960's. In rescuing Cuba from the coils of European domination there was no desire to annex a foot of Cuban soil to the territory of the United States. Although the beautiful island of Cuba was but a few miles from our mainland shores, there was no thought of any American mind to take possession of Cuba as the legitimate spoils of war.

It is true there was a brief period of American occupation while the people of Cuba were preparing to take over the management of their own affairs. But

what is overlooked by both American and Cuban historians is that at the very beginning of the brief period of occupation the United States, then a relatively poor country in material measure, gave its moneys to enable the Cuban soldiers who had fought valiantly for Cuba libre and thus had separated themselves from the ordinary means of sustenance, money with which to buy land and thus reestablish themselves on an economic basis.

Meanwhile, the peoples of Puerto Rico, at long last freed of a cruel European dominion, were facing a devastating famine. The United States, then as I have said relatively poor, gave of its means until it hurt to the relief of a famine that threatened the wiping out of thousands of the men, women, and children of Puerto Rico.

These are the facts of history, discernible by anyone who takes the time and has the inclination to delve in the records for them. I regret that modern American historians, too much concerned with the exciting events of the 20th century into which they were born, at times have seemed to lack both understanding and sympathy with the idealism that marked the closing years of the 19th century.

If American historians, born in the 20th century and often seeming as blind as bats in their interpretations of what happened in the period of the dying 19th century, have not stressed these facts of history, one can scarcely wonder at the confusion in the minds of the people of Cuba.

What we gave from our slender means to rehabilitate the brave and patriotic soldiers of Cuba and to relieve the famine-stricken Puerto Ricans, we did not extract from prostrate and poverty-stricken Spain, whom we had beaten quickly and decisively in the Atlantic and the Pacific and who was at our complete mercy. Even to Spain we forgave the war debts and indemnities, assumed for ourselves the expense of Cuban rehabilitation and Puerto Rican escape from famine, and were satisfied that through our joint efforts with the soldiers and patriots of Cuba and Puerto Rico we had ended the reign of European dominion on American shores.

That dominion never will return as long as wisdom reigns and red blood courses in the veins of the peoples of the American hemisphere, whether they live in our own United States, in Cuba, or any of the other sister republics of America. We have had our experience, and for all time we have ended the interference in the affairs of this hemisphere by any European power or by any power whatsoever outside of our own American hemisphere.

Together, as friends and neighbors in a hemispheric democratic society, we will work out our problems. Social justice must be extended in all the countries in our hemisphere. There must be a stabilization of the markets for the products of our neighbors, the economies of which rise and fall with the buying market in our own United States. There must be a lifting of the fog of poverty and a raising of the horizons of life for

every man, woman, and child on this, our own American hemisphere. Working together, we will attain our objective, a free and abundant life for every man, woman, and child on the American hemisphere, but never, never again will we be enmeshed in the coils of European dominion which were broken once and for all by the war with Spain, triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine* 63 years ago.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body I salute the President of the United States, himself a combat veteran of World War II, and say to him that in his reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine he has spoken not only for the new frontier of the 1960's but as well as for the new frontier and the spirit of 1898.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my dear and distinguished friend from Illinois for the remarks he has made today and for similar remarks he has made during past years since he has been a Member of this body. He is the only Member of the Congress of the United States who served in the Spanish-American War. He not only honors the memory of his comrades with whom he served by having the House pause while he makes these remarks, but he honors each and every one of the Members of this body.

The fact that he salutes the memory of those who served with him in the Spanish-American War illustrates one of the traits of character that has endeared my friend from Illinois to all of us, to the people of his district, to everyone who knows him. It goes with the sweetness of his character and with his courage and determination in the performance of his public duties.

Mr. Speaker, my friend has referred to the 9th Massachusetts Regiment, the old "Fighting 9th of Massachusetts," which has a great record in the military history of our country going back to the Civil War; and later in World War II as one of the regiments that constituted the 101st Infantry Division.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate my friend on the remarks he has made today. I know that his comrades who are in the Great Beyond are smiling down upon him with pleasure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the bottom of my heart, I thank our beloved majority leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, it is a privilege to join in what has been said and to commend the gentleman not only for the service that he rendered during the war but since as a servant of the people of Chicago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], twice the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, in his remarks on the anniversary of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* in the Havana Harbor 63 years ago.

In 1895 the revolt in Cuba had flared up again, after more than a decade of relative tranquillity. During the winter of 1897-98, mobs of Spanish loyalists, resentful of the well-known sympathy of the American people for the Cubans, became formidable. Fitzhugh Lee, the American consul general at Havana, appealed to his Government for support in the form of a naval force in Cuban waters. On January 24, 1898, the *Maine*, a second-class battleship, was ordered to Havana.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been notified of her advent, the *Maine*, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, steamed into Havana Harbor and was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal. The Spanish officials acted with punctilious courtesy, and the social amenities between American and Spanish authorities proceeded according to naval protocol. No untoward incident took place until 9:40 p.m. on the night of February 15, when two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the afterpart slowly sank. Two officers and 250 men were killed at once and 8 men died afterward.

Separate investigations of the tragedy were made by the American and Spanish authorities. The Spaniards reported that an internal explosion, perhaps spontaneous combustion in the coal bunkers, had been the cause; the Americans that the original cause had been an external explosion which in turn had set off the forward magazines.

Later events are admirably summarized by William B. Norris in his article, "The Destruction of the *Maine*," which appears in the Dictionary of American History:

News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain newspapers. Without doubt, the catastrophe stirred up national feeling over the difficulties in Cuba, crystallized in the slogan, "Remember the *Maine*." The wreck remained in Havana Harbor until 1911, when U.S. Army engineers built a cofferdam about the wreck, sealed the afterhull of the ship, the only part still intact, and floated it out to sea. There, on March 16, 1912, appropriate minute guns boomed as it sank with its flag flying. The remains of 66 of the crew which were found during the raising were buried in the National Cemetery, Arlington.

During the removal of the wreck, a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Their report, published in 1912,

stated that a low form of explosive exterior to the ship caused the first explosion. European experts, perhaps influenced by several internal explosions in warships in the intervening years, still, however, maintained the theory of an internal explosion. No further evidence has ever been found to solve the mystery.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, 63 years ago, on the night of February 15, 1898, the U.S. battleship *Maine* exploded and sank in Spanish-held Havana Harbor, and furnished the Nation with a battle cry for the war that followed: "Remember the *Maine*."

The *Maine*, a second-class battleship built at the New York Navy Yard, was launched on November 18, 1890, and commissioned on September 17, 1895. Although she would be dwarfed by modern warships, in her day the *Maine* was formidable. She was 324 feet long and 27 feet at the beam, and had a displacement of 6,650 tons. She carried four 10-inch guns, six 6-inch breech-loading rifles, seven 6-pounder rapid-fire guns, eight 1-pounders, and four Gatling machineguns. In addition she had tubes for four torpedoes.

If the bright sunshine on the morning of launching day was a good omen, it was to be a short-lived one. The *Maine*, in her 2½-year commissioned history, came to be considered an unlucky ship.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the *Maine* arrived in Havana Harbor, ostensibly "to resume the friendly naval visits at Cuban ports," according to the State Department. Actually the purpose was to protect U.S. citizens, supposedly endangered by the increasing friction between the United States and Spain. The *Maine* was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal and the amenities between American and Spanish officials proceeded according to protocol. For 3 weeks no unusual incident took place.

When the *Maine* exploded, accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain American newspapers. Most Americans held Spain responsible, although the evidence was never sufficient to fix blame officially. Some 2 months later came the Spanish-American War, which was to mark the final collapse of the Spanish Empire and the emergence of the United States as a world power.

In the explosion on the *Maine* 2 officers and 258 men were killed at once or died soon afterward as a result of the disaster. One of those who lost their lives was John J. McManus, fireman second class, of Davenport, Iowa.

Regarding the motto, "Remember the *Maine*," Captain Sigsbee, commander of the ship, had this to say:

Therefore I conceive the motto, "Remember the *Maine*," used as a war cry would not have been justifiable. Improperly applied, the motto * * * savors too much of revenge * * * but it may be used in an entirely worthy sense.

During the recent war with Spain about 75 men were killed and wounded in the U.S. Navy. Only 17 were killed. On board the *Maine* 252 men were killed outright and 8 died later—nearly 15 times as many as were killed in the U.S. Navy by the Spanish land and naval forces during the entire war. In the way that the men of the *Maine* died and suffered there was enough of the heroic

to provide a sound foundation for the motto, "Remember the *Maine*."

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for his interesting statements relative to his experiences in the Spanish-American War. Certainly the Cubans of that period appreciated the contributions that the United States made in securing their freedom. But today, at this particular time, it seems that we have not learned very much since the Spanish-American War. At least, our failure to hold the friendship of the Cuban people strongly indicates that we failed somewhere to determine new values in friendship necessary to cement the friendly relations of nations.

It is with a deep sense of love of freedoms for the American hemispheres that we were brought into the Spanish-American War. Certainly, our national policy as to Latin America was based upon the Monroe Doctrine. Today we have abrogated the Monroe Doctrine by agreeing to a hands-off policy on changes in internal government of our South American neighbors even though inimical to the very existence of our form of government. It is sad commentary to look back over the many years and consider the loss of time, money, and effort spent in coveting the friendship of certain Latin American nations.

Many great men developed to American leadership through their activities in the Spanish-American War. I doubt whether President Theodore Roosevelt would have been so readily selected by political leaders as a candidate for public office had it not been for his popular appeal for a peculiar type of character appeal developed during his experiences in the Spanish-American War. I know this, that our distinguished colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, who has all his life fought for the interest of the Spanish-American War veterans, widows, and orphans, deserves high commendation for his invaluable services to God and country in behalf of all veterans during his long period of public life, as a Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and as an outstanding citizen and Representative of that State. We thank him for his contribution this day on the sinking of the *Maine* and, as his colleagues from Illinois, we appreciate the distinguished way in which he has served his State.

We pray that the great President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, will look into the conditions that influence the feelings of the people in their antagonism toward the American people and that after this study is made, he will ask this Congress for corrective legislation to direct and control American capital invested in foreign countries so that these interests contribute to the local and national economy of those countries. It would be much better for maintaining friendly relations with our neighbors if we prevent the investment of American dollars in foreign enterprises. It would be far better if, under the present conditions, we are reaping a

harvest of vicious feeling against ourselves because of the penurious practices of our American-supported industries in foreign countries. The sad circle of the U.S. Government buying friendship with investment dollars in foreign countries and our capitalists destroying the friendships by proselyting the workers.

I congratulate the gentleman on his patriotic presentation to his appreciative colleagues.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my colleague from Illinois.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that no one in Illinois is more beloved by the veterans of all wars than my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]. Everyone in Illinois is tremendously happy that he is to serve them in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of this House.

Mr. LIBONATI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA has generously invited me to join in remarks commemorating the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* in the harbor at Havana on February 15, 1898.

As we know, this tragic demolition of an American battleship cost the lives of 266 Americans, and formed one of the direct causes of the war with Spain.

Sixty-six members of that gallant crew are buried nearby in the national cemetery, Arlington.

We, as Members of Congress, by paying homage to the memory of the heroes of 1898, have the opportunity of focusing public attention on the patriotic deeds of those men who made up the most colorful army in the history of the world—every man a volunteer—the AEF of 1898.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, February 23, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. LOSER).

Mr. MORRISON and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$303.75.

Mr. McDONOUGH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) were given permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. NYGAARD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KING of Utah.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 610. An act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 707. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 804. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think there could be no more appropriate act I could do on this day that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has made such a dramatic and eloquent speech about the Spanish-American War and the veterans of that war than to ask my distinguished friend, as a mark of respect to their memory, to make the motion that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a motion to adjourn was never made with such emotion as is this one.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

590. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Aviation Agency prepared by Administrator E. R. Quesada for calendar year 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

591. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated February 4, 1961, covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

592. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide an increase of \$2 billion in the authority of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) for calendar year 1961"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

593. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a report on a violation of section

3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claims of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex., pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413; 31 U.S.C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 845. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 856. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 858. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 36, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 860. A bill to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 861. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 866. A bill to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2953. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3587. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 4658. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 4659. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4660. A bill to authorize modification of the project Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts, with particular reference to the Kings Lake Drainage District, Missouri; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4661. A bill designating the first Monday in Fire Prevention Week as National Firemen's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4662. A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved August 7, 1959, entitled "Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4663. A bill to amend section 545 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension to widows of World War I veterans shall be increased to \$1,800 without dependents and \$3,600 with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the cost of all medicine and drugs for the taxpayer and his spouse, rather than only the excess over 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, may be included in computing the medical expense deduction where such taxpayer or spouse is 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4665. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from \$1,200 to \$1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4666. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which beneficiaries are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS (by request):

H.R. 4667. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for the substitution of truck vehicles for highway post office transportation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4668. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4669. A bill to amend the law relating to gambling in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of

Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4671. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4672. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4673. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4674. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4675. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4676. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4678. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from \$1 to \$1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4679. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of expenses for the care of certain dependents); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4680. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4681. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4683. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4684. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4685. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of the financial statement, now required by the Veterans' Administration for admittance to Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4686. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for a more equitable distribution of the funds available under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend section 709 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the effective date of national service life insurance applied for by members of the Armed Forces on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 4690. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 4691. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship-repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4692. A bill to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the meat inspection services of the various States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4693. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles made of cotton fiber must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4696. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, including those who served during peacetime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 4697. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4698. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss

or loss of use of both vocal chords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4700. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4701. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4702. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4703. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 182. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursable to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish

the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to pear decline; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Presi-

dent and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4704. A bill for the relief of Nick and Diana Papadopolous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4705. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 4706. A bill providing that the President shall award posthumously in the name of the people of the United States a gold medal to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pierina Di Ciuccio De Cola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEN:

H.R. 4708. A bill for the relief of Humbert A. Lie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4709. A bill for the relief of James L. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 4710. A bill for the relief of Masumi (Theresa Ann) Morishita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4711. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jyotirmay Mitra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4712. A bill for the relief of Daniel Rountree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Nora E. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4715. A bill for the relief of Helena Jasinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 4716. A bill for the relief of Manuel C. and Catalina L. Tampoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4717. A bill for the relief of Athena Nicholas Euteriadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Kusulja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Edward and Betty Daror; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Dr. Henry L. Salvacion, his wife, Herminia Sabello Salvacion, and their minor children, Julius, Myrna, and Shella Salvacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

64. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William Netscert, Daytona Beach, Fla., relative to requesting that no bill be passed which violates the principles of equity originally intended to tie together annuity contributions and subsequent benefit allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Impeachment of Our Chief Justice: An Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, letters are coming in, advocating the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Sometimes accompanying these suggestions are Supreme Court decisions which, in the view of those urging the impeachment of the Chief Justice, tend to make rather than interpret the laws as written by the Congress or the legislative bodies of the States. That is the charge—that the Supreme Court has usurped the functions of the Congress.

Whatever may be our views as to the correctness of the Court's reasoning and final decisions—and I disagree with several of the Court's decisions—at the present time there appears to be no charge which would result in a conviction if Warren were impeached.

REMOVAL FROM OFFICE

Article II, section 4, of the Constitution states that—

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.¹

POWER TO IMPEACH—CONSTITUTION

Article I, section 2, clause 5, states:

The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment.

TRIAL ON IMPEACHMENT

Article I, section 2, clause 6, of the Constitution provides:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.

Whatever may be the reasoning behind this present drive for the impeachment of the Chief Justice, in my humble judgment, not even a majority, much less two-thirds, of the membership of the Senate would vote for a conviction.

¹ Madison, whose objection led to the insertion of the more definite phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors," was the strongest advocate of a broad construction of the impeachment power. He argued that incapacity, negligence, or perfidy of the Chief Magistrate should be ground for impeachment. He also contended that the wanton removal from office of meritorious officers would be an act of maladministration.

However meritorious the criticism of Justice Warren, it would seem to be a waste of time to file impeachment charges with the Clerk of the House.

It is possible that, if those instigating this drive to impeach the Chief Justice would direct their efforts toward some other method of bringing about the desired result, as, for example, remedial legislation, much time and effort would be saved, something accomplished.

Just what has the Chief Justice done that would justify a conviction if he was tried by the Senate?

Several of the decisions made by Chief Justice Warren and concurred in by other members of the Court are, in my humble judgment, completely wrong; in the end will cause us to lose much of the freedom which we heretofore have enjoyed. A real service can be rendered by those who desire the Chief Justice's impeachment by showing to those in local communities the unsoundness of his conclusions.

However, when Justice Chase was on trial, Senator Giles of Virginia said:

"Impeachment is nothing more than an inquiry, by the two Houses of Congress, whether the office of any public man might not be better filled by another * * *."

"We want your offices, for the purpose of giving them to men who will fill them better." *

*John Quincy Adams, *Memoirs*, I, 321, 322 (1874).

The Race in Space—A Communications Satellite in Orbit Proposed by the Bell Telephone System To Improve Our Communications System on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Project Echo which was used to bounce the voice of President Eisenhower across the Nation in a matter of seconds demonstrated the practical use of a communications satellite which could be placed in orbit and used as a relay for voice communication to all parts of the earth by radio bounce.

The proposal by the Bell System to finance the building of their own communications satellite and to obtain permission for its use through the Federal Communications Commission for voice transmission indicates the rapid progress we are making in the use of outer space for practical purposes.

In order to make this possible, it will require the cooperation of the Federal Government to fire the Bell System satellite into orbit and to grant them permission to use our tracking stations in order to prove that this system of voice communication is possible and may become an everyday operation for voice communication to all parts of the earth.

Public interest requires development of a satellite communications system as rapidly as possible.

Heavy use of present overseas cable and radio circuits reflects the rapidly growing need for an expanded and more flexible overseas communications system. Satellites are ideally suited to supplement existing facilities. They offer the most practical means of providing overseas television service and would afford highly desirable alternate routes for other overseas services, many of which are extremely important to our national security.

Project Echo, one of our Nation's most dramatic space achievements, demonstrated our leadership in satellite communications. In an age when national prestige is so important, we should keep that leadership.

Privately owned common carrier industry should do this job.

The usefulness of any space communications system will depend upon the extent to which it can be integrated into existing domestic and international common carrier networks. The Bell System already has a vast domestic network with worldwide links to communications systems abroad. Placing a satellite system in operation would simply be adding another important group of international communications channels through what amounts to microwave towers in the sky.

Furthermore, the Bell System has an unmatched fund of experience in communications research, in systems engineering, and in working agreements with

other American international carriers and foreign telecommunications administrations.

The Bell System hopes to move forward with an active satellite trial in about a year.

Following the highly successful Echo experiment, the Bell System proceeded at its own expense with development and construction of experimental active satellites. These satellites are designed with repeaters to amplify and relay radio signals with power generated from solar energy. They utilize broadband microwave techniques and are of the type ultimately required to provide commercial telephone, television, data, and global communications of all types. The Bell System has been assigned frequencies for experimental use. It has also asked for launching facilities so the trial can get underway within a year.

It has offered to pay for satellite, for launching it, for building ground stations in the United States, and is confident that the communications agencies of other countries will cooperate by providing ground stations abroad.

It will make the satellite facilities available to NASA and U.S. international telegraph common carriers for experimental use.

Bell System space program is in line with national communications policy and with the aims and purposes of NASA.

Long-standing U.S. national policy places the responsibility for efficient public communication, both domestic and international, on the common carrier industry. Throughout its existence the Bell System has accepted this responsibility and has pioneered in all phases of communications research and development.

NASA has broad responsibilities to advance peaceful use of space, making most effective use of scientific and engineering resources of the United States to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts. Its emphasis should be on research and development. Combination of Bell System communications experience and NASA space technology can avoid duplication of effort and result in fastest possible development.

Bell System efforts and plans are, in all major respects, in accord with the views expressed in the December 4, 1960, staff report of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Bell System is prepared to move rapidly, shortening the span between experiment and the goal of a fully operative commercial system of satellite communications.

In October 1960, the Bell System applied to the FCC for an experimental grant for conduct of this trial. Frequencies were assigned in January 1961.

The Bell System has discussed with NASA the provision of launching facilities at Bell expense. Launching date of the first Bell satellite will be determined by the availability of suitable rocket vehicles.

NASA has taken the position that the Bell System satellite trial should wait until after experiments with a proposed new NASA active satellite.

It has called for bids on this satellite, expected to be launched as Project Relay in mid-1962. The first launching vehicles available to NASA for space communications tests will be used in this project.

The Bell System position is clear: We are ready to proceed with trial of an active satellite at our own expense at the earliest possible launching date.

Provision of satellite communications by common carriers is in line with U.S. national policy and does not conflict with the aims and responsibilities of NASA to foster rapid development.

Unnecessary delay could be harmful to our national security, to U.S. prestige, and would postpone international television and other forms of communications not feasible today. Furthermore, the results of trials pointed as directly as possible toward a commercial satellite system are urgently needed to prepare the U.S. position for international space conferences in 1962 and 1963.

Only the cooperation of our Government—by making available launching and tracking services—is needed to get the trial underway.

To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Provide That the Cost of All Medicine and Drugs for the Taxpayer and His Spouse, Rather Than Only the Excess Over 1 Percent of Adjusted Gross Income as Otherwise Provided, May Be Included in Computing the Medical Expense Deduction Where Such Taxpayer or Spouse Is 65 or Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that will assist our senior citizens in meeting the high cost of medical, hospital, and drug expenses by permitting taxpayers 65 or over to deduct the cost of all medicines and drugs, rather than only the excess over 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, when computing the medical expense deduction in their income tax returns.

No similar legislation was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means during the past Congress, although three similar bills were introduced by Members of Congress. The only liberalization enacted during the past Congress removed the 3 percent of adjusted gross income limitation in the case of medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for a dependent father or mother who was of the age of 65 or over. As under prior law, however, this 1 percent limitation rule continues to be applicable to all taxpayers regardless of their age.

I have been concerned about this for some time, and ever since I have been in Congress have tried to find solutions to this problem. I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to my bill during this session of Congress to alleviate this particular problem.

Government Patent Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics looked into the question of whether the present patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 have been hobbling our space effort. That committee reported to the 86th Congress that these provisions should be modified.

Our colleague, Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, was one of the members of that subcommittee. He participated actively in its work and he spoke on the floor of the House when we passed the bill. Recently, he was asked to talk on the general subject of Government patent policy at the Government contracts briefing conference of the Federal Bar Association in Philadelphia.

I believe his speech sets out a distinct viewpoint of what that policy should be. I recognize that a strong controversy exists in this area, and that others hold opposing theories. I believe we will be hearing more of this subject in the coming session and I strongly recommend attention to this statement which I offer for the RECORD:

GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

(Remarks by Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, at the Government contracts briefing conference, Federal Bar Association and National Bureau of Standards, Philadelphia, Pa., February 10, 1961)

The theme of this discussion is "What the Government Patent Policy Should Be." That is a broad topic these days. Certainly I am neither knowledgeable enough nor rash enough to make any positive prediction on the precise question.

But I will make several preliminary observations in regard to (1) the extent of Government interest in patents in the future; (2) what future policy will not be, and (3) something it should not be.

As to the extent of Government interest—you can be sure this will become increasingly high. For one thing, research and development in itself is now one of the Nation's leading industries—a fact deftly emphasized by the late economist Sumner Slichter when he said: "The discovery that an enormous amount of research can be carried on for profit is surely one of the most revolutionary economic discoveries of the last century."

Another reason is that the Federal Government is putting up better than half of all the research and development funds spent in the United States—\$8 billion or more annually—and any time Federal money of this magnitude is involved, considerable

attention is going to be paid to policies governing its use.

In regard to what Government policy will not be, I think it highly unlikely—no matter how much study and effort is made—that we will ever have a uniform, across-the-board patent policy followed by all agencies of government. I know there has been much sentiment for a uniform policy, but I am inclined to go along with the Comptroller General of the United States. Last year Mr. Campbell told our Committee on Science and Astronautics that any overall patent policy will nonetheless have to give "recognition to the functions and problems peculiar to the activities of individual agencies, as well as the differences in the types of research and development being contracted for by the Government." So while we may see the emergence of broad policies and guidelines, I think we delude ourselves if we anticipate the coming of a truly uniform Federal patent policy in the foreseeable future.

Finally, in connection with what should not be done, let me here state my personal conviction that Federal patent policy must not derogate from or be inimical to the American free enterprise system. Anything which tends to alter that system without a substantial compensating public benefit should be shunned. To my mind, the trend toward sweeping Federal ownership of ideas and inventions as promoted by the National Aeronautics and Space Act does not, in practice, qualify as beneficial either to free enterprise or to the public at large. It should be reversed.

I think it will be reversed. And here let me back up a bit in order to indicate why I think so.

As some of you are aware, the Space Act patent section—which is patterned after the Atomic Energy Act and generally places title to inventions made under research and development contracts in the Government—was written into law in Senate-House conferences without being subjected to hearings.

Ever since the National Aeronautics and Space Act was put into effect, its so-called patent section, section 305, has been subjected to criticism from industry and the professions. Critics have regarded the provision as a step away from those constitutional requirements which are designed to protect the interests of the inventor as well as to foster the open publication of inventions. They have expressed particular concern inasmuch as the National Aeronautics and Space Act patent provision is the third major instance since World War II in which Government ownership of inventions has been dealt with by statute. The other instances were the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, under which the Government asserts ownership of inventions, and the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, which, gives discretion to its Director as to the disposition of rights in inventions and patents.

It was largely for these reasons—plus the fact that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had by then had some experience with the practical application of the provision—that the matter was reviewed under the aegis of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In August 1959, Representative OVERTON Brooks, of Louisiana, chairman of the committee, appointed a special seven-man Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions. He appointed Representative Erwin Mitchell, of Georgia, as chairman, and I had the privilege of serving on that subcommittee.

The new subcommittee undertook initial background hearings immediately. Representatives from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration appeared that month in order to brief the subcommittee and advise it on the effect of the patent

provision of the Space Act as it now stands. During these hearings Space Administration officials disclosed that they planned to ask for a change in the provision as part of their 1960 legislative program. For this reason, more extensive hearings were scheduled at a later date in order to give the Space Administration an opportunity to finalize its planned revision and have it cleared by proper authorities.

On November 30, 1959, the subcommittee met to consider the problem in detail. In the course of 12 sessions, running from November 30 through December 5, the subcommittee endeavored to hear all competent Government witnesses as well as all private witnesses who wished to appear.

NASA's recommendations for change approximated the approach of the National Science Foundation—that is, to leave the question of invention ownership to the discretion of the Administrator, who should act "in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the contractor."

On this proposal, the subcommittee received testimony from some 60 witnesses from throughout the Nation and sought to obtain all possible points of view in order to assure a complete record on the subject. The subcommittee agreed to leave the record open for an additional 2 weeks in order to accommodate those who could not appear but who might wish to file statements.

In deciding to recommend a change in the law, the subcommittee recognized that research and development is the heart and soul of the space program and promises to remain so. It recognized that the current law places an unnecessary burden on NASA because, first, it forces NASA to deal with contractors on a different basis from the Defense Department, which normally requires only a royalty-free license to inventions produced under its contracts—although both agencies often contract with the same contractors on similar work. Secondly, the law makes it difficult for NASA to secure the best research for lowest cost and in the shortest time.

We actually found some instances in which the contractors refused to take NASA contracts, but far more important was the obvious fact that contractors who are required to surrender commercial rights to their inventions just do not give NASA their best efforts.

Please note that in more than 2 years of NASA operations involving close to a thousand research contracts, each of which required full disclosure of technical information, only about 50 disclosures of possible patentable inventions or processes were made. This strikes me as rather eloquent proof that the Space Act patent section is not doing what its proponents claim for it. One must conclude, I think, that in its relationships with NASA, industry is careful to utilize almost exclusively developments already under patent or patent application.

In any case, our patent subcommittee approved the change in the NASA Act, but modified it by requiring that in all instances NASA secure from its contracts not less than a royalty-free, irrevocable license. We also stipulated that such license should be sufficient unless greater rights are required under other Federal laws or are deemed necessary by the Administrator in the interest of the national security or welfare. Finally we added, as part of the legislative history, a statement of intent designed to guide the Administrator in determining whether or not to take title to inventions.

This approach was approved by the full committee and passed the House of Representatives last June by a vote of 269 to 120 on a motion to recommit and 235 to 31 on passage of the bill.

The Senate, however, did not take up the bill, so the original patent provision remains in force.

In response to some of the criticism which industry has suffered because of its insistence on patent rights, let me inject a bit of personal philosophy.

I am well aware that some segments of American business have been frowned on as unpatriotic when they drag their feet about doing research work for the Government under contracts which require them to surrender commercial rights in inventions. Perhaps there are instances where this is justified.

But I want to quote this bit from our subcommittee report:

"There are hard reasons why individual contractors do not wish to be classified as ones holding out on research efforts so vital to the Nation. To do so places management officials between the devil and the deep. They are responsible under the private enterprise system for operating a profitable business, yet if they decline Government business because it is unprofitable, they become vulnerable to charges of lack of patriotism. American industry should not be placed in this awkward, often injurious, position."

I subscribe to that position wholeheartedly.

It also seems pertinent to ask what happens when the Government does take title to inventions produced under its research contracts.

If Federal ownership gave the Government an advantage it does not receive from an irrevocable royalty-free license, if it normally enhanced the public interest, if it actually stimulated commercial use of the invention—then the Government pays—Government must own concept would indeed be valid. Inquiry, however, shows that in a heavy majority of cases Government ownership accomplishes none of these things.

The Government does not make, and never has made, any significant effort to protect its patents, or see that they are worked. It does not sue infringers. Neither does it grant exclusive licenses, without which the invention is generally ignored by private industry. Moreover, expert testimony indicates that if the Government did these things on a large scale, it would be competing with private enterprise to the serious detriment of the latter.

This being the situation, there is little apparent value to the Government in claiming title to such inventions. The license which it receives is a broad one. It not only permits complete Government use of the invention with no payment of royalties, but it allows the inventor article to be produced by any contractor chosen. The Government has statutory authority to make, or have made, for Government purposes, any patented product without being subject to injunction, and without subjecting its product supplier to suit. In these cases the only remedy is a suit against the Government for reasonable royalties in the Court of Claims (28 U.S.C. 1498).

Fundamentally, we need to take another look at the Constitution, which gives Congress power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their writings and discoveries."

Under this provision and the patent laws promulgated under it, we have done pretty well for 160 years in fostering technical ingenuity and disseminating scientific information. Nor should we forget that the Government exacts a quid pro quo for its patent protection—and that is to make public complete information concerning the patented invention or process.

Using such a system, we have seen entire firms, companies, corporations—even indus-

tries—arise from the willingness of private capital to exploit protected inventions. This has meant more and better jobs, improved standards of living, and a continuing flow of opportunity for the imaginative and the industrious. It is the only part of our economical concept designed to promote monopoly. But the patent monopoly, also by design, is temporary. And as a matter of fact it rarely lasts the full 17 years; in today's world of rapid communications and technological improvement, the effective life of a patent is usually cut short by marked improvements.

The extreme importance of the patent to private initiative, however, is well illustrated by business in my own Connecticut district of Hartford County.

For example, the Kamman Aircraft Co., which produces vertical-lift aircraft and employs more than 5,000 people, owes its entire existence to one or two patents. In addition, the United Aircraft Co., which is the largest single employer in the State, began its present corporate life in 1925 on the strength of a few internal combustion patents.

Of course there is nothing unique about this. It has happened all across the country. I recall that in testimony before our committee last year, officers of Raytheon Manufacturing Co., in Waltham, Mass., reported that Raytheon's phenomenal post-World War II growth emanated from several basic patents held on the magnetron tube.

This brings me back to the question of why I think the recent trend toward Government ownership of patents arising from Federal research and development contracts will be, if not revised, at least modified.

When our patent subcommittee began work on this problem in 1959, it soon became apparent that while we were concerned primarily with the national space program—that program actually spread across the entire industrial spectrum: electronics, metals, fuels, ceramics, machinery, plastics, instruments, textiles, thermals, cryogenics, and a hundred other areas. Consequently we received a comprehensive picture of professional thinking on the research problem—from large and small business, from Government, from the legal profession, and from educators. There was nothing provincial about it.

From our study we concluded that a compromise position was both possible and desirable.

We could not concur with the theory that the Government should own every invention produced, in whole or in part, with Government research money. This was because—in addition to the practical reasons I have already mentioned—legal reasons also dictate against it. In most instances the Government receives the consideration it bargains for when it receives free use of all developments resulting from its contracts.

On the other hand, we could not go along with those who argue that there are never any circumstances under which the Government should obtain title. We felt that there were some—such as those involving the public health and safety, unjust enrichment, technology without commercial significance, technology developed entirely at Government instance and expense, etc.

So we sought a middle way and expressed it in our Statement of Intent designed to guide the NASA Administrator in his determination of patent ownership.

I believe these efforts have borne fruit, for they appear to be at least partly responsible for moves on the part of the two big research agencies who are at opposite poles of the patent question—the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission—to modify their positions toward the center.

On February 2 this year, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Mr. Banner-

man) wrote a letter to Chairman Brooks, of our committee, in which he stated that a new armed services procurement regulation—to become effective February 15—would recognize instances where it may be desirable to secure title to inventions made under military research contracts. "This recognition," it was stated, "can in large measure be attributed to the work of your committee in endorsing the work of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions."

At the same time, it is interesting to note that subsequent to the work of our committee, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a regulation permitting private contractors to secure greater rights in nuclear inventions for production abroad. In fact, the new regulation, effective January 11 this year, leaves the title in the contractor for purposes of foreign patents—subject to a free Government license and certain other licensing conditions. I am not suggesting that the AEC action resulted from our efforts, but I do believe that the light thrown on the subject by the proposed NASA patent amendments served to stimulate the review process.

Thus, there may be a gradual converging of the extreme positions on this problem into a workable and enduring middle way.

This is my hope at any rate, for I believe that a big part of our Nation's future welfare depends on it.

Inventors' Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many ways in which the people of North Dakota have sought to encourage inventive genius and new industry has been through the sponsorship and support of an annual Inventors' Congress.

The North Dakota Inventors' Congress was first suggested by Andrew Freeman of Grand Forks, N. Dak., to the Greater North Dakota Association which joined with the Inventors Industry Association of America, the industrial committee of the Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce and the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce in sponsoring the first Inventors' Congress.

This first Inventors' Congress was held in Devils Lake, N. Dak., January 20-21, 1957, and as an outgrowth of this congress, the North Dakota Inventors' Association was organized. The original board of directors of this association consisted of Carl F. Smith, president; Milton Ekron, secretary-treasurer; Homer Ludwick, Otis Bryant, L. A. Joyce, Leo Steinman, and C. E. Martin.

The stated purposes of this organization are to "promote and encourage inventions and scientific research, to conduct tests and work to establish standards and codes, to encourage the scientific advancement of its members, to assist each other in protecting and promoting patentable ideas, and to help promote the North Dakota Inventors' Congress."

This year's report on the annual congress lists 687 inventions which have been displayed during the 5 years the Inventors' Congress has been held.

It represents an outstanding effort on the part of the people of North Dakota to show appreciation of inventiveness and a fine contribution to the industrial development of North Dakota.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Receives 1960 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the 10th annual state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park in Washington, D.C., on January 27, 1961, at which the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, presented the 1960 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.—highest tribute of the specialized business press—to Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, for "distinguished statesmanship in behalf of freedom, service, and industry."

This annual Washington dinner traditionally features a question-and-answer period participated in by Cabinet officers, industry and labor leaders, and ambassadors, operating under a tight 2-minute rule for answers. All questions and answers were in keeping with the theme of dinner—"New Frontiers for Business Communication"—and were designed to measure the economic future of America as the state of the Nation was weighed and balanced on the scales of the business community.

Presentation was made before an overflow audience of 1,700 top-management leaders from most of the best-known identifications throughout the sciences, professions, and industries of America at the specialized business press event which remains one of the most notable yearly occasions in this Capital which is accustomed to the best of brilliant banquets.

National Business Publications, sponsors of the award and dinner, is the international association of publishers of over 200 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines in this country and Canada, all independently owned, audited and published. Among the association's principles of practice, all important is the one which pledges active allegiance to the American economic system of free competition. Therein lies the reason for the state of the Nation dinner.

Sound business decisions are essential to continued prosperity in this enlight-

ened economy. Business Publications are dedicated to the proposition of providing a continuing flow of knowledge specific to such determinations. Reason enough why NBP seeks each year to present the Silver Quill Award to that person who has best epitomized those principles for which it stands and through which it serves. The Silver Quill, like the organization which awards it, is synonymous with consecrated service to business and industry and to the Government which guarantees our freedom of enterprise and its interpretation.

Past recipients of the Silver Quill Award and the year for which each was so honored are: 1959, Gen. James H. Doolittle, chairman of the board, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.; 1958, Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Speaker of the House of Representatives; 1957, Benjamin F. Fairless, president, American Iron & Steel Institute and longtime former head of United States Steel Corp.; 1956, Harry F. Byrd, chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate; 1955, Charles F. Kettering, deceased, former director and research consultant, General Motors Corp.; 1954, Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States and Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; 1953, Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States; 1952, Bernard C. Duffy, vice chairman of the board, Batton, Barton, Durstine & Osborn; 1951, Paul Wootton, chairman, executive committee, Society of Business Magazine Editors.

The excerpts from the dinner program follow:

STATE OF THE NATION DINNER AND SILVER QUILL AWARD PRESENTATION, 1961

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES LOUIS J. FERROTTET, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., AND VICE PRESIDENT, CONOVER-MAST PUBLICATIONS, INC.

Ladies and gentlemen, as always, it is our sincerest hope that the state of the Nation dinner will continue its prophecy of ever better times to come. Here—at our head table—are leaders from the free world of Government and industry. Here are the men who will carve out the new frontiers of our free enterprise. They have graciously consented to answer one specific question related to our dinner theme: "New Frontiers for Business Communication." All have agreed to abide by our custom of a tight 2-minute rule. We are also privileged by the presence at our podium of a world-renowned news analyst, commentator, and correspondent. And, to you who number among his millions of Sunday night enthusiasts, he is the moderator of "What's My Line?" He is to be our moderator tonight, asking the program questions. It is my extreme pleasure to present to you Mr. John Daly.

REMARKS BY JOHN CHARLES DALY, DISTINGUISHED NEWS ANALYST AND COMMENTATOR

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Vice President, Admiral Burke, and other members of this distinguished company, I am indeed honored to be a part of this highly respected occasion. I am indebted to my neighbors and friends, who are members of your fraternity, for making it possible. Answers to our questions follow in the order listed in your program. I will initiate each question by simply announcing the name of

the speaker. And, now—if the panel is ready—and in keeping with our theme, "New Frontiers for Business Communication," we begin with Mr. Ambassador Muller.

Questions and answers

Walter Muller, the Ambassador of Chile

Mr. DALY. Mr. Ambassador Muller, if we would increase the economic force of our hemisphere, how do you envision the future role of the specialized business press in channeling the communication of ideas instrumental to an adequate exchange of trade and to the advancement of all of the American Republics?

Mr. MULLER. A fast increase of the economic forces of our hemisphere is an absolute necessity to solve the increasing pressure for higher standards of life in our Latin American countries.

The press, in general, has been called the fourth unofficial power of any free state.

Economic development implies higher production, improved quality, and intensified interchange of commodities and finished goods.

The specialized business press is the most adequate way to convey ideas and methods toward those aims. It bridges the necessary contacts between available capital on one end with development possibilities and lack of resources on the other.

Modern industry requires ever increasing specialization and machinery to produce quality goods at convenient prices. The business press keeps the information channels open to supply the knowledge of those improved methods.

Production without markets is a waste of capitals and efforts. Markets without goods represent an unfortunate loss of possibilities. I am sure that the specialized business press will face the challenge of faster economic development and improve its methods to fulfill this important task.

George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Mr. DALY. Mr. Meany, reliable researchers substantiate the contention that advertising as well as the editorial content of specialized business publications is read for information and instruction—which would seemingly provide a distinct difference between business-press advertising and that carried by general interest publications. Since criticism in some quarters labels all advertising as simply an additional cost to the consumer, would you be good enough to give us your reactions to the economic force of business communication as represented by the specialized business press which must, characteristically, encompass only advertising of a technical or know-how nature?

Mr. MEANY. It is obvious that advertising of any kind should represent something more than merely an additional cost to the consumer.

Technical information, new processes, new products can be advertised skillfully and usefully in the specialized business press.

It is important that information about the many advances in technology, science, and industrial know-how receive as wide distribution as possible. Progress and competition can best be served by a wide knowledge of the different developments in the different fields of endeavor in American life.

To the extent that specialized advertising can promote competition and can lead to greater efficiency in production and distribution, it can, of course, aid the consumer. We certainly hope that such advertising will consistently be used to serve that end. This requires, however, that the advertising include detailed information, accurate description, and careful analyses concerning the product or process involved.

From my point of view, as a trade unionist, I am hopeful that the interest of competition

and greater efficiency could be served by specialized advertising, so that the consumer will really benefit from the variety of products and ideas that are developing every day in the industrial and agricultural world. Of equal importance, of course, is the necessity that the machines and processes and chemicals produced by those who advertise them are made under the most favorable working conditions in America—conditions that insure adequate labor standards. As you know, one form of advertising the labor movement has consistently supported is the advertising of the union label as a mark of decent working conditions.

* * *
John B. Connally, Jr., the Secretary of
the Navy

Mr. DALY. Mr. Secretary Connally, the ships of our Navy not only serve as emissaries of good will wherever they sail; they also communicate the image of U.S. strength and security. In supporting that image—in reciprocating the good will it engenders—do you consider it imperative that we utilize our channels of business communication to share the fruits of our technology, and thus encourage the economic growth of other members of our family of free nations?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Daly, my answer to that, very simply, is "Yes." In my opinion, international relations should be everyone's business. Those relatively few Americans—and I assume that there is a large percentage of them here tonight—who are privileged to visit, to do business with, to have contacts with our neighbors throughout the free world should always be aware of the role that they play in these contacts and in these relations.

The Navy, Mr. Daly, as your question implies, has always taken a great deal of interest in this very thing. It's easy for us. The very nature of the naval operations makes the whole of the free world our close neighbors. People-to-people activities have long been a Navy tradition and a proud heritage of the Navy. Businesses—foreign and domestic—are no different. They are made up and run by and for people.

Now, the idea of using your channels of business communication—to foster a new business-to-business program—should provide an important new channel of communication between this Nation and other nations and peoples of the free world. Certainly, if it is an effective program, it will do much to engender, to foster and insure mutual understanding which is so vital and necessary now among all the peoples of the free world.

Raymond E. Olson, President, Taylor Instrument Cos.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Olson, in the area of communication relating to results from research and development which are customarily made available to industry via the specialized business press—do you experience any detriment to your production and distribution which could be attributed to the classification of technical material? Of course—my question is in no way meant to refer to the declassifying of any material which might endanger the national security.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Daly, ladies and gentlemen, we in industry, of course, do not know what we have missed. In the first place, I would like to say that we in industry do not advocate releasing classified research data which, if released, would endanger our national security.

It is possible, however, that certain of our agencies in the Government have information which might be helpful to the industry. For example, the Navy might have information on ultrasonics which would be helpful to industry if released. That may apply, also, to unusual high-temperature materials. Still another example might be

in the field of computers, where the Pentagon must have a wealth of data which could be immediately useful to manufacturers.

The Research Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has, I believe, recommended that such data be automatically released after a 2- or 3-year period. It should, of course, be carefully screened before release. It so happens that the Atomic Energy Commission has a very active program to systematically declassify material which is very useful to industry. We do not know of any other Government agency which is operating accordingly.

To us, unnecessary withholding of potentially useful material derived from many of Uncle Sam's programs, imposes a triple penalty—the individual company, the industry involved and our position in international trade are handicapped possibly by duplicated expense and unusual and unnecessary delay.

To us, the specialized business press—represented by this occasion tonight—is a logical medium for communicating declassified material in keeping with its role of supplying useful information to business and industry.

Koichiro Asakai, the Ambassador of Japan

Mr. DALY. Mr. Ambassador Asakai, in your country—as in ours—business communication is recognized as the lifeline of industrial and commercial progress. In the dissemination of technical and professional information through both its advertising and editorial pages—how do you estimate the strategic importance of your own specialized business press in stimulating productivity and the expansion of international trade?

Mr. ASAKAI. One of the dividends enjoyed by a nation with a high literacy rate is the great respect accorded to the written word. Despite the great expansion of the radio and television media in Japan in recent years, books, magazines, and newspapers have one of the largest and most appreciative body of consumers in the world. For example, daily newspaper circulation per capita of total population is one of the highest in the world.

Similarly, business, professional, and technical journals abound, and there is scarcely an industry in Japan, even quite narrowly defined, which does not have a trade publication or journal. Many in this audience know that these technical and business publications are full of reports on the latest worldwide developments in technology, management, marketing, and other matters of direct and practical concern to operating businesses.

One index of the importance accorded advertising, for example, is that the leading advertising firm in Japan ranks fifth in the world after the four leading firms in the United States.

In direct reply to your question, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the business press in Japan is as important as it is in the United States in stimulating productivity and in increasing domestic and international trade. I might also add that precisely because the press is important, any adverse trade news or even rumors, emanating from abroad, is widely and quickly disseminated in Japan. This shows how sensitive Japan is to trade problems and developments and explains her great dependence on foreign trade for her national survival.

Russell DeYoung, President, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Mr. DALY. Mr. DeYoung, business communication—as evidenced by the special-interest advertising and editorial material found in business publications—cuts across all other boundaries, in providing our free world business communities with unmatched approaches to mutual respect and cooperation. Since your operations are worldwide and so closely related to the export potential

of American-made products, what is your concept of the specialized business press as an international marketing medium?

Mr. DEYOUNG. Mr. Daly, advertising and other forms of business communication can gain new stature in these troubled times by assuming the role of ambassador, as well as salesman, in the international field.

We, as a nation, can do much to neutralize other political beliefs by effectively communicating the philosophy of American business life to the citizens of other countries.

After World War II, communism flourished openly in many European lands. The Reds brought Rome, Paris, and other capitals almost to their knees with general strikes. A creeping socialism threatened England. There was little industry and few markets for products.

But, as the economic picture strengthened, the Reds and their allies declined in popularity. The Communist threat to take over governments by electoral victories weakened.

Can the specialized business press help keep this victory for democracy won? It can—by proclaiming the advantages of a system that rewards individual initiative.

Operating for a profit is not an international disgrace. Because America has operated on this philosophy since 1776, there is a strong Western Europe today and a healthy economic revival in Japan.

In many U.S. industries—including ours—the international field is the fastest growing market. Distances are shrinking daily. But shortening these lifelines is of little value to the world economy, if the peace is constantly threatened.

It would seem that communications in Business Publications could well serve a dual role by selling the concept of free enterprise, as well as our products, in foreign lands.

Call it what you will, patriotism or self-preservation, we of the free world are all seeking the same end.

J. Edward Day, the Postmaster General

Mr. DALY. Mr. Postmaster General—until just a week ago—you were a senior officer with the third largest corporation in the world. Tonight, you are the chief executive of the biggest business of its kind, reaching out into every community at every level of national activity. As such—do you think, in your new assignment, you will apply the principles you followed in a private business enterprise?

Mr. DAY. Let me say that, while I do not believe the Post Office Department is completely like a private business, we intend to run it in a most businesslike way.

The question from your chairman gives me an opportunity to express publicly, for the first time, some of the basic ideas which we bring to this Department. In the first place, the Post Office has the primary responsibility of providing a real service to the people of this country. As part of that service, the Department performs functions far removed from the normal transmission of communications—even to the registration of 3 million aliens a year and even selling migratory bird stamps.

While we aim at increased efficiency, lower cost, and better service, we fully realize that the post office today must fulfill many roles that are far broader than mere communications.

We feel that the most efficient and economical movement of the mails is our No. 1 objective. We further feel that the new administration can and will make new and immediate economies in its management and publicity functions.

We will now be able to study at firsthand the manifold opportunities for long-range cost-cutting programs, elimination of frills and our own opportunities to create a realistic budget. This budget will be based on a

thorough appraisal of the relationship between our cost, the huge deficit we have inherited and the functions which the post office performs, which are comparable to private business versus those which are of a unique public service character.

Frank Pace, Jr., Chairman of the Board, General Dynamics Corp.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Pace, the vast undersea area of the globe began to be exploited last year for the first time for strategic missile deterrence by the Polaris system. Major upcoming advances in knowledge and use of the seas include an attempt to punch a hole through the hard crust of the earth, known as "Mohole"; increased missile activity on the surface and below the seas; achievement of economical desalinization of sea water. Can you comment on those developments; can you offer suggestions which will enable the business press of the Nation to keep on top of such developments?

Mr. PACE. John Daly, I ponder deeply on this question. The next 40 years for America is going to be a period of crisis. Winston Churchill described a crisis as a dangerous opportunity. In America, we came to think that when we conquered the West that we might have reached the ultimate in achievement. And yet, it's well to remember that two-thirds of the world's surface is submerged under water. And that world is still quite unknown to us. We haven't reached it, we haven't conquered it, we haven't even understood it. We have made the start.

Today, one of the great strengths of the free world lies in the Polaris launching submarine which lends itself to our philosophy of defense through strength. As we probe our way into the ocean's depths, we find not only new phenomena, but new sources of food and new sources of mineral.

As we reach for desalinization of sea water, we find a solution to the great problem of our times—hunger. Communism feeds on the hungry. When we reach out with our competence—our urge for the future to solve that problem—we are realizing the quality of democracy.

And, if we are going to do it, we're going to do it through the system that has taken us where we are today—the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system functions only when it is challenged as well as understood.

The function of the business press is not just to praise it or to make it understood, but to challenge it and to criticize it. If this is done, then this system that has served us so well in the past will be a means of carrying us down the high road of the future to leadership of the free world.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES LOUIS J. PERROTTET

Ladies and gentlemen—we come now to the climax of our evening and that ever proud moment for the specialized business press—the presentation of its Silver Quill Award. You may be sure that there were numerous candidates recommended to the selection committee—all outstanding; all deserving. However, none sparkled with such brilliance as the naval hero who is to receive our highest tribute tonight.

We are greatly favored by the presence of another great man of far-reaching leadership throughout the free world. A statesman of no small stature—a Senator and majority leader of unprecedented accomplishment—and now the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Vice President—the Business Press of America is and always will be honored by its association with you and your momentous endeavor. We are delighted to have you here—not only in your newest capacity, but as a distinguished naval officer and flyer—to present the Silver Quill Award for 1960.

REMARKS OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1960 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman, Lieutenant Daly, most distinguished guests, my friends and sponsors of the Silver Quill—20 years ago this month, I was a shipmate in the Navy with two of your most distinguished guests this evening—Ensign Connally, who is now your Secretary, and Lieutenant Commander Burke, who is now the Chief of Naval Operations. And I am the oldest commander, in grade, in the history of the U.S. Navy.

My memory goes back to the closing of the Texas Legislature some 30 years ago, in the middle of the depression, when the Texas senator who had authored the Economy Act called up a friend of his who was a judge in his hometown, and said, "Judge, I just wanted to tell you that we passed the economy bill tonight and abolished your court." The judge said, "You didn't do it without a hearing did you?" He said, "No, we had a hearing." "Well," he said, "who testified that my court ought to be abolished?" The senator said, "Well, the mayor testified." The judge said, "Well, let me tell you about that mayor. We had to burn up several ballot boxes in every county to elect the man the first time." "Well," the senator said, "he wasn't the only one that testified." The president of the bar association testified that we didn't need two courts." "Well," he said, "let me tell you about the president of the bar association. He represents the criminal element in our section." "Well," he said, "the banker testified that we could do without your court." "Well," he said, "let me tell you about that banker and all of his family. They have been charging usurers rates ever since that bank got its first charter." "Well," he said, "Judge, I think I ought to tell you that I was just kidding you after all. A motion was made to abolish your court, but I fought that motion and I won. The bill has gone to your Governor and your court is still intact." The judge sighed a sigh of relief and said, "Senator, why did you call me up and make me say some ugly things about three of the most beloved friends any man ever had?"

Now, I shall not transgress on your time to talk to you about my beloved shipmates—some of the best friends any man ever had—but I do ask your indulgence for a moment while I speak of one.

All of us, as freedom-loving men and women, are heavily dependent upon dedicated citizens who devote their lives to standing between us and those who are out to destroy the freedoms that we cherish so much. Throughout history, every nation has been deeply indebted to such men, but there has probably never before, in all the history of this Nation, been a time when our debt was deeper.

Tonight, as we meet here, we have reached a stage where total tyranny has become a physical possibility. And we know it would not only be a possibility but a reality, unless we had the capacity to fight back against aggression.

We have come here tonight to honor a man who has devoted his entire life to the defense of our freedom. This is a man whose name has become legendary in his own lifetime and who will certainly be remembered as one of the most outstanding military figures in the history of the world. He has fought for us in time of war; he has fought to prepare us in time of peace.

I cherish this privilege and I am proud of the distinct honor that is given to me tonight to present the Silver Quill Award to an old friend, to a fighting sailor, but, most of all, to a great American—Arleigh A. Burke.

REMARKS OF ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, IN RECEIVING THE 1960 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 27, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, an honor such as this can only be accepted with great pride. But it is pride tempered with humility.

To live up to the principles inherent in this award will indeed be a high goal. But the obligation to make the endeavor will always be with me.

These state of the Nation dinners, however, are far more than occasions to honor individuals. These meetings held by the National Business Publications perform outstanding service for our country.

This annual forum brings together the leaders of government and industry to discuss and develop solutions to our national problems. And throughout the year, the business press continues to help solve those problems. It provides a main channel of information—of technical knowledge and professional experience—that is essential in maintaining the world leadership of the United States in the years ahead.

Today the United States is the strongest nation in the world—politically, economically and militarily. As a nation, we have the power to overcome the perils of the future and still further we have the wisdom and the ability to exploit the opportunities of the future.

Our goals are not easy ones. We face a great many problems and underlying most of our problems is the Communist ambition to dominate the world.

In preparing for the uncertainties of the future, we can, however, make plans and in making these plans we do have certain beacons which can guide us safely through treacherous waters.

Our basic national policy is stated simply and directly in the preamble to the Constitution. To perfect our Union, to establish justice and order, to provide for our security, and most of all, to preserve the blessings and responsibilities of liberty for ourselves and for future generations.

These same precepts—these same fundamental concepts—determine the kind of military power we need to safeguard and preserve our precious freedom. For it has become apparent that neither we, nor our freedom, could long exist as an island of liberty, in a world engulfed by communism.

Today our Nation is an integral part of a free world community. And the fortunes of that community bear directly upon the United States.

We are a charter member of the United Nations and a permanent member of its Security Council. We have joined in treaties and coalitions with over 40 other free countries. We are bound by declaration and alliance with NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States. We share in the hopes, in the aspirations, and in the efforts of free people all over the world.

This free world unity is of tremendous importance to the United States. Not only in military terms—but in political and economic terms as well. For, as important as military ties—as military alliances may be—the foundation of real military strength is economic productivity and political stability.

The citizens of our great country have willingly supported a very sizable Military Establishment in order to maintain this strength. We have a powerful Air Force, a magnificent Army, a Marine Corps without equal anywhere in the world. And we have the strongest, most effective Navy in history.

The importance of naval power—the importance of control of the seas—is increasing. And this means control not in some vague undefined future but now, today, and every day thereafter. The Navy must main-

tain a position of strength—demonstrable strength—so great as to leave no doubt that we can and will maintain the freedom of the seas.

A look at a globe shows clearly that there is a significant characteristic common to most of the nations of the free world. They border on the sea.

The free world is actually a maritime confederation. This confederation depends for its very existence upon the sea communications which bind it together. Cut off these communications and many countries of the free world would find themselves isolated without help, without supplies, without reinforcements, and at the mercy of some totalitarian aggressor.

From Scandinavia, all the way around to Japan, members of this maritime confederation depend on free world control of the sea for their support. And that is why our Navy's responsibility to control the seas has never been greater than it is today.

Our fleets are guarding the interests of the United States in the principal trouble spots of the world. A few weeks ago they were off the coast of Guatemala and Nicaragua. Today, trouble appears in southeast Asia. Tomorrow, the trouble areas may shift elsewhere.

But wherever trouble is brewing, the U.S. Navy will be first at the scene, ready for action. Our ships will stand guard in troubled waters, as long as it is in the interests of the United States to do so.

Our Navy can move on the oceans wherever it is needed. Our ships can operate on the high seas without raising any problems of foreign sovereignty. They carry the most powerful weapons, but in a quiet unprovoking manner. Our deployed fleets play a dual role. They offer assurance to friends and a warning to aggressors.

The U.S. Navy is ready today. It must be ready to fight and win, today or tomorrow, whenever it is called upon.

Keeping our Navy ready, keeping our Navy supreme on the seas, is everyone's job. Everyone in the U.S. Navy, from seaman to admiral, is working hard at the task of making a better, more effective Navy.

We also need the help of every citizen in the United States. We need their under-

standing of the tremendous problems we face. We need continued, enthusiastic support in our efforts, from all segments and sections of our Nation.

Many of you here tonight have already contributed tremendously to this task. That is why I welcome this occasion to express my personal and official appreciation to the National Business Press—and to industry which it serves so well—for all that they have contributed to the betterment of the Navy.

Scientists and engineers have helped us simplify the design of our weapons. They have helped us to eliminate unnecessary gadgets, to reduce costs, without sacrificing combat effectiveness.

Such contributions as these are particularly important, because weapons and weapons systems are getting more and more expensive and complex. Savings must be made in every way possible and simplicity in design and operation is vital because our new weapons are not going to be operated by scientists but by the same Navy men who have served their country so well in the past.

The technological progress that is being made today would not be possible without the active and enthusiastic support of manufacturers. The Navy will need that support to conduct research—to close the time-gap between ideas and actual hardware—to speed up our progress and our deliveries of weapons to the fleet—to stay at maximum readiness.

But readiness is not alone a matter of material. Readiness cannot be bought with money—for readiness is also a state of mind: It is the diligence and zeal of the scientist; it is the enthusiasm and wisdom of the teacher; it is the will and determination of all our citizens.

A sense of pride in one's work, a sense of urgency in personal accomplishment, the qualities of alertness, imagination, and competitive enterprise—these are the vital ingredients of national readiness.

These are the qualities which our Nation must have in the critical times ahead. I am confident that the people of the United States have these qualities in abundance, and that they will use them wisely and well.

Once again, thank you for the great honor which you have bestowed upon me. The

Silver Quill is an honor that I will always cherish and tonight is an evening that I will never forget.

Mr. Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when Mr. Paul Wooton, the distinguished senior Washington correspondent for the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune and the beloved and respected dean of the press corps in our Nation's Capital, passed to the other side of eternity, our country and my State lost a most valuable human asset.

During a full and fruitful lifespan of 79 years, Paul Wooton left his mark upon the times in which he lived. A gentleman in the fullest sense of the meaning of the word, he was an outstanding member of the Fourth Estate, respected and loved by his colleagues and close associates and sincerely admired by all who knew him well, and he was the personification of good citizenship at its best.

At funeral rites on Saturday, Mr. Wooton's minister paid tribute to his life and his work in this manner:

If you were a journalist he was what you would want to be, and as a man he was what you would want your son to become.

It was a great honor and privilege for me to have known Paul Wooton as a man and friend and newspaperman. And now, with a deep sense of personal loss, I join in extending my sympathy to his three surviving sisters and to his close associates and coworkers.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we come before Thee on this anniversary of the birthday of the founder of this Nation, to participate in a traditional ceremony that has been observed in the Senate for many years since his death. In honoring him today, we honor ourselves; and, through honoring him, we honor Thee for the blessings which Thou didst bestow on him in the days of his service to this Nation.

The problems he faced were much the same as the ones we face today; only the circumstances are different. These problems grow essentially out of the weakness of man; and their solution must be found in the strength that man can draw from the inspiration received

from Thee and received from men such as George Washington.

As we face our responsibilities, we ask that Thou wilt bless us, in our turn, as he was blessed. Bless us, we pray, that we may draw inspiration from his example, and may draw strength from the record of his strength. We realize that, essentially, all his strength came from Thee; and we seek Thee as our source of strength in our time of need.

Bless us, we pray, that we may be able to preserve the haven of peace and liberty which he helped to create.

We ask these blessings in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 20, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee had appointed Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, Mr. KING, of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, of Illinois, Mr. MASON, of Illinois, and Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois, as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. YATES and Mr. IKARD of Texas, excused.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the reading of the Farewell Address by our first President, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.